



AUMLA

7

November 1957

AUMLA

Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association

(Affiliated with the F.I.L.L.M.)

*Formerly the Australasian Universities Modern
Language Association*

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM,
PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS

Editor: R. T. SUSSEX

Associate Editor: I. H. SMITH

Editorial Board:

K. F. QUINN

J. SMIT

F. M. TODD

Manuscripts for publication forwarded to the Editor should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope, though the Editor can accept no responsibility for return of manuscripts. In accepting articles for publication the Editorial Board will normally give preference to those submitted by members of the Association.

Editorial Address:

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY

CHRISTCHURCH NEW ZEALAND

PRICE TO NON-MEMBERS: 10s (Australian); 8s (New Zealand)

Contents

MAURICE DAVID GOLDMAN	<i>page</i> 3
SWIFT'S STRULDBRUGGS: THE CRITICS CONSIDERED, R. G. Geering	5
GEORG FORSTER AND GOETHE, J. A. Asher	15
HELLENICA OXYRHYNIA AND SOME RELATED PROBLEMS, T. R. C. Weaver	20
ASPECTS OF PORTUGUESE, B. W. Ellis	27
SEVENTY YEARS IN THE HISTORY OF GOETHE'S 'URFAUST', D. R. Coverlid	43
LA DESCENDANCE AUSTRALIENNE DU POETE PIBRAC, M. Chicoteau	50
BOOK REVIEWS	52
BOOKS RECEIVED	78
ASSOCIATION NEWS	79

AUMLA

Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association

NO. 7 NOVEMBER 1957

IN MEMORIAM M. D. GOLDMAN

Maurice David Goldman, professor of Semitic Studies in Melbourne, who passed away on the 15th September 1957, was an active and enthusiastic member of our Association and a foundation member of the Australian Humanities Research Council. He was also the most amazing linguist that we have had in Australasia.

As a schoolboy in Poland he acquired five virtually native tongues: Polish, Russian, German, Yiddish and Hebrew. For a while he studied medicine in Germany, but inevitably came back to linguistic work, and joined the Semitic Languages staff in the University of Berlin. He mastered Arabic, Aramaic, Syriac, Ethiopian and all the Slavic languages that he had not learnt at school; and naturally he took most other European tongues in his stride—including Classical Latin and Greek.

Altogether, Goldman must have known some forty languages, and he was fluent in at least fifteen. Yet he was no mere polyglot: for him, mastery of a language meant knowledge of its ancient and modern forms, insight into its literature, acquaintance with the whole of its etymological and semantic periphery. Thus, for example, he did not think his grasp of Arabic adequate until he had studied Persian and Turkish.

For his Berlin doctorate he translated the Ethiopian *Book of Jubilees* into Hebrew, with critical and exegetical notes in the latter tongue. In Melbourne, he founded a review of Biblical studies, and undertook research work on the Dead Sea scrolls. His text-book of Hebrew Grammar (in German) was a model of scholarship, lucidity and sound pedagogy, and he was working on

an English version of it when he died. In the early years of the war he was employed at the Censor's office in Melbourne; and finding that nobody there could handle Maltese, he promptly added this language to his list.

It would be impracticable to enumerate here his many contributions to scholarship. A full list of his publications will be issued in the near future by the Australian Humanities Research Council.

As a scholar, Goldman was a prodigy, and it was a great privilege to have him as a colleague in Melbourne. It was an equally great privilege to enjoy his friendship, for he was a most generous, modest, affable man, and a Lucullus in his hospitality. Despite his phenomenal erudition he was endowed with a fine sense of humour, and he did not hesitate to have his bright little elementary Hebrew reader adorned with Disneyesque illustrations by a Jewish artist living in Melbourne.

Maurice Goldman's passing means a sad loss to scholarship in Australia; a loss still more tragic to the many friends who hold him in affectionate remembrance. At his funeral, conducted according to the Jewish rite, we were asked each to put a flower on his coffin. It was a moving gesture, and a most apt one; for all the fairest flowers of humanism had blossomed in that capacious mind that has passed on.

A. R. CHISHOLM

SWIFT'S STRULDBRUGGS: THE CRITICS CONSIDERED

R. G. GEERING

New South Wales University of Technology

The account of the Struldbruggs which occupies Chapter X of Part III of *Gulliver's Travels* has won less attention than it deserves. Critics of the third voyage tend to concentrate on the scientific projectors, often failing to note that in Luggnagg Swift exposes Gulliver too, but as a projector of a different kind. And there have been few attempts to examine in detail either the particular literary merits of this chapter or its relationship to Swift's general design.¹ Much of the criticism of the third voyage has been concerned with Swift's antipathy towards science, probably because it is easy to attribute the weaknesses in the satire here to his ignorance of what he is satirizing.²

It is less important, however, to emphasize Swift's prejudice in scientific matters than to understand the moral and social implications of his attitude. Inflexible in his life-long opposition to all forms of abstract speculation, Swift had no time for the idea of science as the furthering of knowledge for its own sake. So in satirizing the scientists he attacks the mis-direction of enquiry and the misapplication of knowledge. Furthermore, it is of projectors in general that he disapproves, political, commercial and moral, as well as scientific. Johnson defines 'projector' as 'one who forms wild, impracticable schemes,' and the projectors satirized in *Gulliver's Travels* are examples, in other forms, of the enthusiasts and pedants Swift ridiculed at the beginning of his literary career in *A Tale of a Tub*. Basically the attack is directed against those who exalt the less above the more important, self above society, science above religion, against those who want knowledge at all costs, even if it is divorced from, or runs counter to, morality and the common good. The Struldbrugg chapter, which brands Gulliver as a moral projector, is one of the most powerful of the many onslaughts in a book given over to the condemnation of pride.³

The commonest approach to this chapter is the biographical. It is easy to see in it prophetic forebodings of Swift's own approaching old age and then, for confirmation, to read his letters from 1727 onwards, in which he complains continually of the mental and physical afflictions he has recently heaped upon the Struldbruggs. But just as Swift was able to turn to imaginative account in this episode his rather naïve ideas for language reform (merely by

accepting the fact of linguistic change to show its isolating effect on his immortals), so he creates out of his most morbid fears and imaginings something more than a statement of a personal and sterile despair.

Though much concerned with the behaviour of man in this world, Swift was never given to religious speculation about the next. So in the Struldbrugg episode he is content simply to observe the effect of long life upon his immortals; he does this by making them subject to all the calamities of ordinary old age, which are intensified as they grow older. If in Parts I and II of *Gulliver's Travels* he uses the microscope and the telescope, and in Part III for the most part a series of distorting mirrors, he may be said here to be relying on the naked eye alone. To produce this terrifyingly clear picture he needs no artificial aid to focus the image. The Struldbruggs are freaks of nature, born at rare intervals and purely accidentally into ordinary mortal families. Once born they can never die, no matter how much they may want to. They behave like mortals for the first thirty years, after which they grow increasingly melancholy and dejected until the age of eighty. At the age of eighty they become

opinionative, peevish, covetous, morose, vain,
talkative, but incapable of Friendship and dead
to all natural Affection⁴

consumed by envy and impotent desires. Their memory decays, and, indeed, the happiest are those who can recall nothing whatsoever of the past. Any marriage between Struldbruggs is dissolved by law when the younger of the pair reaches the age of eighty.

For the Law thinks it a reasonable Indulgence,
that those who are condemned without any Fault of
their own to a perpetual Continuance in the World,
should not have their Misery doubled by the Load of
a Wife.⁵

At eighty they are regarded as legally dead and can take no part in the usual business of life. At ninety they lose their teeth and hair and all taste for food and drink, and the 'Diseases they were subject to still continue without encreasing or diminishing.'⁶ Furthermore they are deprived of the only other occupations they might still be expected to enjoy, reading and conversation, by the gradual decline of memory and the rapid changes in language which after a period of two centuries make it impossible to converse either with Struldbruggs of another era or with their fellow countrymen, the mortals. Despised and hated, they are reduced finally to begging

to eke out the scanty living allowance given them by the state.

It will be seen that Swift concentrates on the miseries of old age, rather than on immortality as such, and to do this he distinguishes between the perpetuity of youth and the perpetuity of life. In his version of the Tithonus myth he does not allow his immortals even the pleasure of becoming grasshoppers; they simply grow old encaged in their own bodies. Hawkesworth, in his notes on this chapter (1755), feels that Swift is pushing his condemnation of old age too far and seems worried lest Swift should be suspected of unorthodoxy.⁷ Swift's concern is more likely to have been to find the most effective artistic expression for his sense of the utter vanity of Gulliver's (and mankind's) desire to prolong life, and to preach the lesson of philosophic resignation. The *Struldbuggs* are an indictment of the folly of too much love of life, an expression not only of Swift's physical revulsion against the miseries of old age but also of his spiritual dissatisfaction with man's desire to extend his life on earth at all costs. The moral of the fable, it is true, is expressed mainly through the gruesome physical detail, but the sense of revulsion which is so strong in the account of the Yahoos, and tends there to overpower and mislead the reader, is here held in check so that he is in no danger of confusion. Pathos replaces indignation, and creates a sombre picture that is all the more powerful by reason of its subdued tones. The *Struldbugg* episode dramatizes the idea 'Every Man desires to live long; but no Man would be old.'⁸

Most of the critics who have thought the episode worth literary comment agree that it is the best and most powerful chapter in what is otherwise the weakest of the four voyages. Orrery and Scott both singled it out for special comment and commended its excellent moral.⁹ Leavis¹⁰ and Quintna¹¹ have praised its power and emotional intensity. W. A. Eddy says it is the only immortal part of the third voyage, but is, nevertheless, still inclined to treat it as an isolated incident which expresses 'only a melancholy renunciation of life itself.'¹² Some critics have noted, if briefly, its place in *Gulliver's Travels* as a whole, and have rightly drawn attention to the part it plays in the disillusionment of the hero.¹³ Two criticisms, in particular, those of Case and Middleton Murry, deserve examination, because they are worked out in some detail and because they come to different conclusions about the place of the *Struldbuggs* in Swift's general design.

In his essay 'Personal and Political Satire in *Gulliver's Travels*,' Case takes the political allegory of the first voyage to be primarily a defence of the Oxford-Bolingbroke ministry and, incidentally, an attack on the Whigs.¹⁴ In the third voyage, he says, the emphasis

is reversed so that the object of the attack is now the Whig ministry under George I.

which is accused of experimentation in the field of government, and of fostering experiments in many other fields.¹⁵

In the essay 'The Significance of *Gulliver's Travels*' Case discusses the structure of the whole work.¹⁶ Taking it as a 'politico-sociological treatise,' he sees each voyage as a different approach to the main problem, and Swift's method as an alternation between negative and positive statements of principles—the first and third voyages are chiefly attacks on the evils of bad government, the second and fourth voyages expositions of good government. Furthermore, he finds another pattern superimposed upon this fundamental design; the first and second voyages are contrasted, one depicting a typical European government more corrupt than average, the other a government better than average, but neither in itself an extreme. Case concedes that no such exact symmetry is to be found in the third and fourth voyages, but argues that Swift could best make his contrast of extremes, of the ideally good and bad, by combining them in a single book (the fourth), otherwise the ideally good Houyhnhnms could not understand the nature of evil. Hence the third voyage becomes a second description of bad government *in esse*, complementary to Book I—Book I attributing mankind's misfortunes to vice, Book III to folly. In the light of this analysis Case sees Book III not, as many others have done, as a number of disjointed scenes, but as criticisms of history and science subsidiary to the single, main purpose—the attack on folly in government. Case then fits the Struldbrugg chapter into the pattern of Book III. Though it may seem the episode most dissociated from the main scheme of Book III it is, he says, logically related to the purpose of this voyage.

The whole chapter is one more rebuke to human folly which, giving itself over to wishful thinking, conjures up imaginary and impossible ways of dealing with the ills of society, instead of recognising the nature of mankind as it is and approaching human problems from a practical point of view.¹⁷

The difficulty in accepting Case's main argument arises from his desire to narrow the whole work down to a treatise on government instead of taking it, in a broader sense, as a commentary on human nature in general. Case sees it as a political rather than a moral satire, an attack on vice and folly in the operation of

government, rather than a condemnation of vice and folly in all their manifestations. Case's attempt to fit the *Struldbrugg* chapter into what he believes is the consistent logical pattern of Book III is only partially successful, because it takes into account only part of Swift's meaning. Chapter X is more than an exposure of Gulliver's folly in assuming that long life will automatically bring the wisdom necessary for solving the problems of society; it also condemns him (and this more important) for regarding death as the 'universal Calamity of human Nature'¹⁸ and for supposing that man needs only to free himself of the fear of death to achieve wisdom and eternal happiness. Gulliver is guilty of sin as well as folly. Admittedly he is foolish to think that the ills of society can be cured as easily as he imagines; but (what is more) he commits the sin of pride in questioning the wisdom of Providence which has ordained death as part of the natural order. Swift is satirizing here 'the universal Desire and Wish of Mankind'¹⁹ for long life, man's desire to have life on his own terms instead of God's, his attachment to material things, his spiritual arrogance and pretensions. It is the love of life for its own sake, and its corollary the fear of death, that Swift is attacking, and not just man's failure to approach 'human problems from a practical point of view.'²⁰

The analysis made by Case of the general design of *Gulliver's Travels* is well applied to Books I and II, but, as he himself admits, does not apply as neatly to Books III and IV. He is compelled to fall back on the argument that Swift himself has deliberately modified the original design of the work; and this is the sort of concession that any critic will be driven to make who is not prepared to accept the fact that even masterpieces are seldom perfect in construction. And the argument provided—that Swift has modified his plan to make possible the contrast of extremes within Book IV between the ideally good and bad—is in itself open to criticism. Case says:

This course not only made the contrast between the two ideals more vivid, but also made it possible for Swift's ideally good Houyhnhnms to understand the nature of evil, which would otherwise have been beyond their comprehension.²¹

Why then, has Gulliver's Houyhnhnm master no understanding at all, till Gulliver enlightens him by using European examples (a 'labour' which 'took up several days' conversation) of 'the terrible effects of Lust, Intemperance, Malice and Envy'.²² Are such vices as these exhibited by the Yahoos, or not? If they are, why does Gulliver's master not recognise evil when he sees it? If, on the other hand, it is argued that the Yahoos are simply

brutes, they cannot be blamed for acting like animals, and moral judgment then becomes irrelevant. What then becomes of the argument that the Yahoos are included to make it possible for the Houyhnhnms to understand the nature of evil? It seems that any understanding the Houyhnhnms get (or, more precisely, Gulliver's master gets) of the nature of evil comes through Gulliver rather than from a simple contrast between themselves and the Yahoos.²³

The essential point of Chapter X is surely that Gulliver here sheds his last illusion and comes to terms with death. This, in brief, is the conclusion of Middleton Murry's analysis, and accepting it means rejecting some of the claims put forward by Case for Book III, and insisting that Chapter X is more closely related to the other three books than to the rest of Book III.²⁴ According to Murry, Gulliver learns two things from the encounter with the Struldbruggs: that death is a merciful release, not a universal calamity; and that the wisdom he seeks is not to be found through the prolongation of any specifically human experience. So the Houyhnhnms, a different species from the human, are the superior beings he thought he had found in the Struldbruggs—they have made their peace with death. If we leave out Laputa, Balnibarbi, and Glubbudrib, says Murry, 'there is an evident progression in Gulliver's attitude towards his return home from the countries in which he is successively caught.'²⁵ Gulliver has been glad to leave Lilliput and Brobdingnag; it is in Luggnagg, on hearing of the Struldbruggs, that he for the first time wants to stay for ever, but he is cured of this desire when he learns the truth about them, and makes off as fast as he can. As he learns more of the Houyhnhnms, his desire to stay increases, and he leaves finally only because he is expelled. There then remains the problem of reconciliation to human life back home, and here Murry emphasizes the part played in Gulliver's long and bitter readjustment by Don Pedro. So Murry develops his analysis of Book IV to substantiate the conclusion that Gulliver's getting of wisdom is 'a painful process of self-discovery and self-annihilation.'²⁶

Perhaps the most obvious feature of the Struldbrugg episode in support of Murry's insistence upon an intimate relationship between this chapter and the other three parts of *Gulliver's Travels* is its emotional intensity. The tone and mood, quite unlike anything else in Book III, are in the manner of the final voyage. There is, too, the undeniable fact that in Chapter X the narrative interest, which elsewhere in Book III dissipates itself in a number of separate journeys, is once more firmly resumed. Thus Swift pre-

pare the way for the closing stages of Gulliver's progress towards wisdom and self-knowledge.

The sheer literary skill of the Struldbrugg episode also sets it apart from the rest of Book III. Here we are lured back to a world in which we are prepared, as in Lilliput, to believe. Swift's narrative powers re-assert themselves in the characteristic touches of detail and, especially, in the building of climax. There is the precisely observed detail in the description of the circular spot on the forehead of a Struldbrugg, a kind of physiological caste mark which is red at birth and about the size of a threepence, changes to green after twelve years, becomes blue at the age of twenty-five, and finally black at forty-five, having grown by then to the size of a shilling. Gulliver is enraptured at the thought of these immortals; he assumes age means wisdom and imagines them as 'living Examples of ancient Virtue,' as masters ready to instruct their fellow countrymen 'in the wisdom of all former Ages,'²⁸ and he assumes, too, that the Struldbruggs themselves must be happy in the thought of their immunity to death. He cannot understand why none of them should appear at court as counsellors to the king, but concludes reasonably enough, that 'perhaps the Virtue of those Reverend Sages was too strict for the corrupt and libertine Manners of a Court.'²⁹ With perfect economy Swift thus underlines the blissful ignorance of his hero, who then expresses his wish to pass his life in conversation with the immortals. One of the Luggnaggians, luring Gulliver further into the prepared trap, asks him how he would use his time if born a Struldbrugg, and Gulliver eloquently expounds to the assembled group his ideal of the immortal life. He would make himself the wealthiest and most learned of men, and as chronicler, moralist, and historian would become the epitome of wisdom. In his enthusiasm he is caught off guard for the first and only time in Book III; up to this point he has been, as Case describes him in the third voyage, 'the detached and half-cynical commentator on human life from without,'³⁰ but he now takes the plunge and in expressing his deepest and most irrational desires reveals his ambition and pride.³¹ His second thoughts are for the community at large—how it could benefit from his learning and wisdom—but he has already placed himself before society. He imagines himself in serene detachment, above the worries and threats of life, contributing towards the perfection of all knowledge. This is the search for the philosopher's stone—the summit of intellectual and spiritual pride. This foolish, rapturous outburst leaves Gulliver open to counter-attack, and the blows come with crushing force as he learns the grim truth about the 'blessed' immortals. He is cured forever of his desire

for long life. The chapter ends with a chastened Gulliver quietly and sensibly approving the Luggnaggian laws to check the avarice of these decrepit creatures, who want to die but cannot. The way is now clear for the voyage to the Houyhnhnms, who accept death without lamentation between the ages of seventy and seventy-five. Gulliver comes finally to the conclusion that Swift expressed elsewhere:

It is impossible that anything so natural, and so universal as death, should ever have been designed by providence as an evil to mankind.³²

This is what the fable of the Struldbruggs is really about.

In the equally well-known passage that follows in 'Thoughts on Religion', Swift, the advocate of reason, is reluctantly compelled to admit that in two matters of the greatest importance, the propagation of the species and the love of life, God apparently intended passion to prevail over reason.³³ If we consider these two passages, we can see why it is that Swift goes on from the Struldbruggs to create the Houyhnhnms. The Houyhnhnms live rationally; they neither desire life for its own sake, nor marry for love; they represent the superiority of reason over passion. Swift needs the security of this belief (though he is realistic and honest enough to have his doubts about its validity) because he feels that man cannot save himself unless he subordinates his passions to rational control. His attempt to separate reason and passion into good and evil enables him in Book IV to state his dilemma with great intensity and dramatic force, but prevents him from resolving it in human terms.

The Struldbrugg chapter serves a double purpose in the structure of *Gulliver's Travels*. The exposure of Gulliver as a projector links it with Part III, but the branding of him as a moral projector helps to establish more firmly Swift's general design.³⁴ So, in its concern with sin as well as with folly, and in its insistence upon the central theme of pride, it is closely related to Parts II and IV. In narrative skill it is superior to the rest of Part III and equals the best chapters in the first voyages. In its sense of climax and emotional power it recalls the King of Brobdingnag's famous denunciation of Gulliver's fellow-countrymen (and Gulliver's pride in them), which is matched again later by the intensity Swift injects into his picture of the Yahoos. Given the satire on the virtuosi and other projectors, it is hard to imagine an episode better calculated than the account of the Struldbruggs to bridge the awkward gap with which Swift was faced before launching Gulliver on his final climactic voyage. According to Herbert Davis, the Struldbrugg

Swift's Struldbruggs

chapter may have been, in point of composition, the last chapter of *Gulliver's Travels* Swift wrote;³⁵ its tone and moral, its finality of utterance seem to support this. That is not to say it would have been better used as a conclusion to the entire work. For reasons suggested above, Swift wanted, and was in fact compelled, to leave the reader where he (Swift) found himself—in the thick of a dilemma. And this is one good reason why *Gulliver's Travels* retains in our day its power to fascinate, provoke and disturb.

When Shaw says 'Had Swift seen men as creatures evolving towards godhead, he would not have been discouraged into the absurdity of describing them as irredeemable Yahoos enslaved by a government of horses ruling them by sheer moral superiority.'³⁶ he is both expressing an optimism Swift was incapable of feeling, and exaggerating and misinterpreting Swift's pessimism. The point of *Gulliver's Travels* is, finally, not simply that man is an irredeemable Yahoo, morally inferior to the horse, but that he is only *animal rationis capax* instead of the *animal rationale* that Swift would like him to be.³⁷ Swift's philosophy is expressed in the opening paragraph of the sermon 'On the Poor Man's Contentment' in traditional Christian terms:

The holy Scripture is full of Expressions to set forth the miserable Conditions of Man during the whole Progress of his Life; his Weakness, Pride and Vanity; his unmeasurable Desires, and perpetual Disappointments; the Prevalency of his Passions, and the Corruptions of his Reason; his Deluding Hopes, and his real, as well as Imaginary Fears; his natural and artificial Wants; his Cares and Anxieties; the Diseases of his Body, and the Diseases of his Mind; the Shortness of his Life; his Dread of a future State, with his Carelessness to prepare for it; and the Wise of all Ages have made the same Reflections. But all these are general Calamities, from which none are excepted; and, being without Remedy, it is vain to bewail them.³⁸

The Struldbruggs are designed to warn us against the desire to have life on any other terms.

NOTES

¹ Two outstanding exceptions are Arthur E. Case, *Four Essays on Gulliver's Travels* (Princeton, 1945) and J. Middleton Murry, *Jonathan Swift* (London, 1954). These are considered later, see pp.4-7.

² But see Marjorie Nicolson and Nora M. Mohler, 'The Scientific Background of Swift's Voyage to Laputa', *Annals of Science*, ii (1937).

³ Gulliver was, apparently, once a scientific or a political projector. See

Gulliver's Travels. Works xi, p.162. ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1939).

⁴ Ibid. p.196.

⁵ Ibid. p.196.

⁶ Ibid. p.197.

⁷ *The Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Walter Scott (Edinburgh, 1814) xii, pp.272-3.

⁸ *Satires and Personal Writings by Jonathan Swift*, ed. W. A. Eddy (London, 1952), p.414. Not included in the Davis edition of 'Thoughts on Various Subjects'.

⁹ Orrery, *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr Jonathan Swift* (London, 1752), p.164. Scott, op.cit. xii, p.11.

¹⁰ 'The Irony of Swift'. *The Common Pursuit* (London, 1952), p.74.

¹¹ *The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift* (London, 1953), p.316.

¹² *Gulliver's Travels. A Critical Study* (Princeton, 1923), p.165. See pp.165-70 for a treatment of allusions and possible sources.

¹³ e.g. Herbert Davis. *The Satire of Jonathan Swift* (New York, 1947), p.102. John Brooks Moore, 'The Role of Gulliver', *M.P.*, XXV (May, 1928), pp.469-80. Moore, in developing his argument for what he calls 'The Sophistication' of Gulliver, over-emphasizes the consistency and greatness of the characterization.

¹⁴ Op.cit., pp.70-94.

¹⁵ Ibid. p.80.

¹⁶ Ibid. See especially pp.105-14.

¹⁷ Ibid. p.114.

¹⁸ *Gulliver's Travels*, p.192.

¹⁹ Ibid. p.195.

²⁰ Case, op.cit. p.114.

²¹ Ibid. p.111. This is Gulliver's explanation too; *Gulliver's Travels*, p.259; see also p.280.

²² *Gulliver's Travels*, p.228.

²³ Ibid. p.232, and p.280. For Swift and the problem of evil see Quintana, op.cit., pp.161-2. and for the relationship of Gulliver to the Houyhnhnms and the Yahoos see *Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus*, ed. C. Kerby-Miller (London, 1950), pp.317-9.

²⁴ Op.cit. For the full analysis of Book III see pp.330-6.

²⁵ Ibid. p.335.

²⁶ Ibid. pp.339-40. For the negative supporting argument, see Murry's criticism of the inconsistencies and weaknesses of the rest of Book III, pp.330-4.

²⁷ cf. Kerby-Miller, op.cit., p.319.

²⁸ *Gulliver's Travels*, p.192.

²⁹ Ibid. p.192.

³⁰ Op.cit., p.117.

³¹ cf. Quintana, *Swift. An Introduction* (London, 1955), p.163.

³² 'Thoughts on Religion', *Works* ix, p.263.

³³ Ibid. p.263.

³⁴ Quintana (*Swift. An Introduction*, p.161), discussing the relationship of

Part III to Parts II and IV, argues that its position, though logically faulty, seems justified artistically.

³⁵ Op.cit., p.102.

³⁶ 'Postscript. After 25 years'. *Back to Methuselah* (London, 1945), p.300.

³⁷ Letter to Pope, Sept. 29, 1725.

³⁸ *Works* ix, p.190. See also 'On the Testing of Conscience', p.152, and p.158.

GEORG FORSTER AND GOETHE

J. A. ASHER

University of Auckland

In his *Study of Goethe* Barker Fairley rightly emphasizes that "the years between 1775 and 1786, crucially important years in Goethe's development, were left in a curious mistiness which has never been fully dispelled".¹ Through this mistiness can be glimpsed, intermittently, the figure of Georg Forster. As a writer and thinker, Forster profoundly influenced the outlook of German statesmen and writers, including Goethe. But the relation of Forster to Goethe has been completely passed over by the latter's biographers. Indeed, the majority of them, including Fairley, do not even mention Forster's name.

As far as is known, the first meeting between Goethe and Forster took place in Kassel in September 1779.² Four years earlier Forster had returned to England from accompanying Captain Cook on his second voyage round the world (1772-1775). He arrived in Germany in November 1778, and shortly after was appointed to a Professorship at the Carolinum in Kassel. At the time when Goethe visited him, ten months later, Forster was almost at the height of his fame. His *Reise um die Welt* (1778) had established his name not only as a great traveller, but also as one of the most advanced thinkers, and accomplished stylists, of the time. There can be little doubt that it was *Die Reise um die Welt* which first brought Forster to Goethe's notice. But, by the time he came to Kassel, Goethe had certainly heard much of Forster as a personality, for as such he had already made a deep impression on those who knew him. 'Er ist ein gar herrlicher junger Mensch,' wrote Jacobi to Sophie

Laroche in November 1778. 'Ich habe lange niemand gesehen, der mir das Herz so abgewonnen hätte wie dieser Forster, und einen ähnlichen Eindruck hat er auf alle gemacht, die hier mit ihm umgegangen sind'.

At the beginning of September 1779 Forster was sought out in Kassel by two strangers who turned out to be Goethe and the Duke Karl August of Weimar.³ Goethe was subdued and attentive in Forster's company and questioned him exhaustively on the South Pacific countries, in particular New Zealand and Tahiti, described in *Die Reise um die Welt*. In a letter to Jacobi written after their departure Forster comments: 'Goethe war ernsthaft, machte wenig Worte, frug mich wegen der Südländer, über deren Einfalt er sich freute, und hörte die meiste Zeit zu, da mich der Herzog befragte, in dessen Gegenwart wir uns fast immer nur gesehen haben'.⁴ And, in a letter to his father written at the same time: 'Goethe ist ein gescheiter, vernünftiger, schnellblickender Mann, der wenig Worte macht; gutherzig, einfach in seinem Wesen. Pah! Männer, die sich aus dem grossen Haufen auszeichnen, sind nicht zu beschreiben. Der Charakter eines Mannes von hohem Genius ist selten wetterleuchtend und übertrieben, er besteht in einigen wenigen Schattierungen, die man sehen und hören muss, aber nicht beschreiben kann'.

From the time of their first meeting Goethe and Forster remained in reasonably close contact, either personally or by letter, until the death of the latter in 1794. In 1783 the poet came again to Kassel and visited Forster. Two years later, accompanied by his wife Therese, Forster visited Goethe in Weimar. The last personal meeting between the two was in August, 1792 when Goethe, again accompanied by the Duke of Weimar, spent two days in Mainz, both evenings being passed in Forster's company. Goethe, on his way to France, promised that, on his return, he would visit Forster again, but Mainz was occupied by the Republican Army in October 1792. Two years later Forster was dead.

Forster's influence on Goethe's writing deserves examination. Goethe's work entitled *Fragen und Mutmassungen* (referred to in the *Italienische Reise*, 12 October 1787 and elsewhere) was designed specifically for Forster. But it is lost to us and conceivably was never completed. There is no real parallel in Goethe's writing to Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* which, as Josef Nadler has emphasized,⁵ is based in part on Forster's writings (and was, incidentally, one of Goethe's favourite books). And there is certainly no parallel in Goethe's poetry to Gottfried Bürger's Sturm und Drang poem, *Neuseeländisches Schlachtlied*.⁶ The latter poem is based, line by line, on Forster's

description of happenings on the South Island of New Zealand, and testifies to the far-reaching influence exerted by Forster on the writing of his contemporaries. There are admittedly slight textual parallels between, for example, Goethe's *Gesang der Geister über den Wassern* and Forster's imaginative picture of the waterfall in Dusky Sound, and it is possibly no coincidence that this poem was written by Goethe only a few weeks after his first meeting with Forster. But if the poem echoes Forster, the echo is a very distant one, and the direct inspiration was given to Goethe by a waterfall a good deal nearer home: the Staubbach in Switzerland. The effect of Forster's *Reise um die Welt* on Goethe's poetry was indirect.

It is in Goethe's overall attitude to nature and to man that Forster's influence is most clearly to be seen. Barker Fairley comments in his *Study of Goethe*: 'The letters definitely point to 1779 or thereabouts . . . as the real starting-point for Goethe's new use of his faculties, and from here on there is abundant evidence of it. One of the first clear indications is to be found in a letter to Charlotte, written on 3 October 1779 . . . Here, perhaps for the first time, Goethe was voicing a conviction about law in the natural world that was to play a major part in shaping his mind from this time on. The conviction may have been implicit before, but, if so, it was clouded by the disorderliness of his moods and never got clearly expressed. It took him till now, when he was turned thirty, to realize it and say it in words that we cannot mistake. This realization marks the autumn of 1779 as an important date in his inner biography . . . Wieland, a usually trustworthy observer, wrote to Merck on 17 January 1780 that Goethe had come back [from his tour, which included his meeting with Forster in Kassel] *multum mutatus ab illo* and Böttiger noted, though only at second hand, that he was like another person—*ganz metamorphosiert*.'⁷

The conclusions Fairley arrives at, concerning the importance of autumn 1779 in Goethe's development, appear, like most of his conclusions, to be now generally accepted by scholars. What Fairley fails to mention is Goethe's meeting with Forster at this very time. That the date of their meeting coincides with the beginning of Goethe's 'metamorphosis' is significant enough in itself. Moreover Forster, who was a brilliant and persuasive conversationalist (Friedrich Schlegel described his conversations as 'Kunstwerke'), believed fervently in the union of science with literature, and it is this very development which we see in Goethe subsequent to autumn 1779. And it is no coincidence that Goethe's new ideas on law in nature are reminiscent of those found in Forster's *Reise um die Welt*. There can be little doubt that Forster contributed decisively to the sudden change in Goethe's 'inner biography'.

Goethe recognized the brilliance of Forster's writings not only in content, but also in form.⁸ In a letter to Forster written on the 25 June 1792, Goethe remarks: 'Für den zweiten Teil Ihrer Ansichten danke ich recht sehr. Sie haben mir dadurch viel Vergnügen gemacht. Die Geschichte der brabantischen Unruhen scheint mir fürtrefflich geschrieben . . . Auch hat es nicht mir allein, sondern jedem, der es gelesen, Freude gemacht. Ebenso ist der übrige Teil des Buches so angenehm als unterrichtend, man mag wenn man geendigt hat gerne wieder von vorne anfangen.'⁹ Schiller likewise, despite his differences of opinion¹⁰ with Forster, shared Goethe's admiration for Forster's style. The latter's treatise *Über die Humanität des Künstlers*, which appeared in Schiller's *Thalia* in 1790, is described by Schiller in a letter to Huber (1790) in the following terms: 'Auch seine unhaltbarsten Meinungen sind mit einer Eleganz und Lebendigkeit vorgetragen, die mir einen ausserordentlichen Genuss beim Lesen gegeben hat. Danke ihm in meinem Namen und meiner Seele dafür.' Josef Nadler, one of the more sensitive present-day critics in the field of style, likewise comments: 'Forster war ein Meister des deutschen Stiles . . . Und der Wirkung dieser entzückend ursprünglichen Sätzchen voll Gegenwart und Tatsache kann sich auch das verwöhnteste Sprachgefühl nicht entziehen. Jedes Zeitwort ist lebendig, das wölbt sich und trägt und fließt und streitet und arbeitet.'¹¹ It would be tempting to suggest that the stylistic developments seen in Goethe's prose style subsequent to the publication of *Die Reise um die Welt* in 1778 are in some measure attributable to his reading of Forster. But Goethe's prose style is consistently individual, and if Forster's 'magical' use of language influenced his style, the influence was, like that on Goethe's poetry, indirect, and cannot be proved by textual parallels.

All in all, it was the content of Forster's works, and his personality, which probably had the most enduring effect upon Goethe. Even long after Forster's death Goethe retained a nostalgia for the South Seas, where nature and man were still untainted by the artificial laws created by the European. In a conversation with Eckermann dated the 12 March 1828, Goethe remarked: 'Man sollte oft wünschen, auf einer der Südseeinseln als sogenannter Wilder geboren zu sein, um nur einmal das menschliche Dasein ohne falschen Beigeschmack, durchaus rein zu genießen'.

NOTES

¹ Barker Fairley, *A Study of Goethe*, Oxford, 1947, p.67.

² See, for example, Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Gedenkausgabe der Werke*,

Forster & Goethe

Briefe und Gespräche, herausgegeben von Ernst Beutler, Zürich, 1951, Vol. 18, p.440, An Ernst Josias Friedrich v. Stein, den 15 ten Sept. 1779.

³ For an account of their journey to Kassel and arrival there incognito see, for example, W. Andreas, *Carl August von Weimar*, Stuttgart, 1953, p.423.

⁴ Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche*, herausgegeben von Ernst Beutler, Zürich, 1951, Vol. 22, pp.119-120, J. G. Forster an F. H. Jacobi, September 1779.

⁵ Josef Nadler, *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*, Regensburg, 1931, Vol. 3, p.126: "So stand Herder auch unter dem Eindrucke, den die Schriften und Aufsätze des Weltumseglers Georg Forster auf die Zeit machten." Also Josef Nadler, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, Vienna, 1951, p.268.

⁶ This poem, written in the *Lenardostrophe*, was published in the *Musenalmanach* in 1782. Translated into English, it appeared in Flügel, *Flowers of German Poetry Selected*, Berlin, 1811. It is available in any of the standard editions of Bürger's poetry, e.g. G. A. Bürgers *Ausgewählte Werke*, Stuttgart, 1840, Vol. 2, pp.5-6.

⁷ Barker Fairley, *A Study of Goethe*, Oxford, 1947, pp.82-83.

⁸ Quite apart from his own writings, Forster was a most gifted translator, particularly from English. His translation, *Cooks dritte Reise* (1781), moved Goethe deeply (see his letters to Charlotte, 19th and 20th December, 1781). On reading in 1791 his translation of Sir William Jones' version of *Sakontala* (originally written by the Indian poet Kalidasa), Goethe sent Forster in gratitude the following lines:

Will ich die Blumen des frühen, die Früchte des späteren Jahres,
Will ich was reizt und entzückt, will ich was sättigt und nährt,
Will ich den Himmel die Erde mit einem Namen begreifen;
Nenn ich Sakontala dich und so ist alles gesagt.

⁹ Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche*, herausgegeben von Ernst Beutler, Zürich, 1951, Vol. 19, p.187, Goethe an Johann Georg Adam Forster, Weimar den 25. Juni 1792.

¹⁰ Schiller was later to attack Forster roundly for his support of the Republicans in Mainz. See the *Xenien: Elpenor, Unglückliche Eilfertigkeit, Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes admonet* and *Die dreifarbigte Kokarde*. See also H. König, *Die Clubisten in Mainz*, Leipzig, 1875.

¹¹ Josef Nadler, *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*, Regensburg, 1931, Vol. 3, pp.287-288.

HELLENICA OXYRRHYNCHIA AND SOME RELATED PROBLEMS¹

T. R. C. WEAVER

University of Western Australia

The field of Fourth Century B.C. Greek historiography is a graveyard, or at best a deceptively gleaming sepulchre. It is significant that by far the most important achievement of scholarship during the last half-century and more, in this very important period in the development of ancient historical writing, has been entitled '*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*', and the magnitude of the problems (and the heaps of rubble) is indicated by the fact that Jacoby² has identified no fewer than 51 historians of the period.

The principal problem concerns the authorship of the most considerable fragment of 4th Century historical writing, both in quantity and quality, that has yet come to light, the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. This papyrus text of 950 lines, discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1906,³ deals with the events of 396 to 395 B.C. in the main areas of the Greek world on an ample scale, according to a chronological system of summers and winters, i.e., the war-year, derived directly from Thucydides. There are no speeches, but several digressions, of which that on the Boeotian Constitution is the most notable; the topographical and prosopographical detail is admirably exact and abundant; lastly, the date of composition is firmly fixed in the mid-4th Century, between 386 and 346 B.C. The one thing that was missing was the title page. Here Oxyrhynchus gave historians their heart's desire, but unaccountably sent leanness into their souls withal. For of all the noted names proposed and defended, changed and rejected by scholars from Ed. Meyer and Wilamowitz to De Sanctis and Jacoby none has stood firmly against the sweeping tide of destructive examination. For some the *horror vacui* has been more compelling than the *horror errandi*, and of this feeling Cratippus was the chief beneficiary.

1 *Cratippus*

At least three known facts can be produced about Cratippus.

Fact No. 1 Dionysius of Halicarnassus (De Thuc. 16) assures us that Cratippus was one of the continuators of Thucydides. Indeed the two flourished together, and when Thucydides died, Cratippus collected material for what had been left untold and

wrote this up, offering some independent criticisms of Thucydides' use of speeches as he did so.

Fact No. 2 Plutarch (De Glor. Athen. 345 C-E), after giving a selection of events recorded by Thucydides, continues with names and places of the Peloponnesian War and its aftermath occurring in the work of Cratippus. Plutarch evidently takes Cratippus for a participant in the events which he narrated.

Fact No. 3 Cratippus made no use of speeches (Dion. Hal. De Thuc. 16).

It seems that Cratippus did exist and did write history. But we are told by Jacoby⁴ that he was not a contemporary of Thucydides at all, but a late-Hellenistic writer, and, what is more unsettling, by Schwartz⁵ that Cratippus was a "forger" *der durch die maske eines zeitgenossen seinem elaborat ansehen verschaffen wollte*. To support these contentions (they both amount to the same thing) they offer four doubtful assumptions.

Assumption 1 That Didymus and Diodorus had never heard of Cratippus, because when naming the continuators of Thucydides they mention only Theopompus and Xenophon.⁶

Assumption 2 That references to Cratippus in Didymus' Life of Andocides and in Marcellinus' Life of Thucydides⁷ are really marginal notes added by later hands.

Assumption 3 That the alleged continuation of Thucydides by Cratippus was not yet published when Didymus worked on Thucydides: it was altogether new when Dionysius Halicarnassus made use of it, and Dionysius, a good critic, it is conceded, was deceived because he had not read the forgery at first hand. Plutarch also cannot have read Cratippus at first hand. Gomme pertinently asks: "I wonder who did."⁸

Assumption 4 Jacoby then proceeds to build up his version of Cratippus' 'Preface'. It was long, it dealt with his reasons for differing from Thucydides' method especially in the matter of speeches, his reasons for wanting to continue Thucydides, and why he considered himself fit to complete the torso.

After constructing with many a fanciful detail this alleged Preface of Cratippus, which has no more foundation than the imagination of the scholar, Jacoby calmly says: 'Cratippus' Preface seems impossible about 390 B.C. or even in the first half of the 4th century, that is, before Isocrates and others had made style the standard for judging a historian's work, and opened their works with long disquisitions about it.' This is building castles in the air, assumption upon assumption. What do we know about

Cratippus? Little, except that he was a younger contemporary of Thucydides, until it is more convincingly proved otherwise. What was his stature as a historian? Evidently less than Xenophon's. Perhaps his insignificance was deserved. He seems to have had little appreciation of Thucydides. Can he be seriously considered for the grand position as author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*?

2 Ephorus

It is necessary next to say something of Ephorus, and his claims to the authorship of *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, henceforth referred to as P.

Of details concerning Ephorus's life we possess depressingly little, and even this, as is common with ancient authors, is disputed, all except his origin in Cyme, which he is at pains to point out in numerous partisan asides.

He wrote what Polybius applauds as a 'Universal History', though this was Hellenocentric and meant in practice little more than a history of all Greek peoples. He took as his starting point the return of the children of Heracles to the Peloponnese, claiming that all events before this contained an inseparable admixture of fiction, and he continued to an even more curious finishing point, the siege of Perinthus by Philip of Macedon in 341-0 B.C., leaving the Sacred War, which ended in 346 B.C., to be written up by his son Demophilus. The matter was divided between books on the famous *κατὰ γένος* or 'subject' system. All this comprised 30 books.

Let us look first at the *ipsissima verba* of Ephorus that have been preserved to us. The roll-call reveals a meagre 220 lines. They owe their survival to the scholiastic caprices of Stephanus of Byzantium, Harpocration and others, and commonly take the form: X, king of the Y's in the region of Z, had two sons A and B. *or*: 'nearby is the city of Aenos which Greeks from Alopeconnesus first founded and later settlers came from Mytilene and Cyme.' (fr. 39). Such samples are not stylistically revealing. But an analysis of their distribution is more startling. 96 lines, or more than two-fifths of the whole, come from the description of the Dorian conquest of the Peloponnese in Books I-III and the geographical excursus covering Europe and Asia in two books, IV and V. The remaining 120 lines embrace all the Universal History proper, from books VI-XXX. And if we take away the 22 lines of Demophilus in Book XXX we are left with a bare 100 lines of the real Ephorus. Before 1919 however, the position was much worse. Literary sources, if scholia may be so dignified, could raise a bare 44 lines. In that year Grenfell and Hunt opened the way for a revolution

in the study of Ephorus by publishing P. Oxy. 1610⁹—fragmentary, of course, but salvaging over 50 lines of real Ephorus untainted by the vice of scholiastic selection. This meant not only a doubling in the quantity of our text of Ephorus, but also a substantial gain in the quality of text. The period dealt with was the Pentacontaetia, and several minor points of the thin historical tradition of this period were cleared up.

Much more important, however, was the fact that a decisive verdict was now possible on Ephorus' claim to be *the* Historian from Oxyrhynchus. Briefly, the matter is thus. Diodorus Siculus, of the Augustan period, was the most patent compiler of all antiquity. But just how unabashed a plagiarist he was can be gauged from the following passages: Ephorus F. 191. 3 says:¹⁰

ἐκεῖνον μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡτιμασμένον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς ἐκείνου πράξεις . . . ἀξιοθεῖσαν . . .

Diodorus Book XI. 59. 3 has:

ἐκεῖνον μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡτιμασμένον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς ἐκείνου πράξεις ἐπαιρομένην . . .

Again, Ephorus F. 191. 8 has:

παραθαλαττίων καλουμένων πόλεων ὅσαι μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἦσαν ἀπψικισμένοι, παραχρῆμα συνέπεισε . . .

Diodorus XI. 60. 4 repeats:

τῶν παραθαλαττίων πόλεων ὅσαι μὲν ἦσαν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπψικισμένοι, ταύτας παραχρῆμα συνέπεισεν . . .

These are not merely parallel passages but identical repetitions.

Now it had been observed that coincidences occurred between P. and the corresponding portion of Diodorus,—sometimes a name, a word or phrase, sometimes the order of events or the motivation of actions. It had been thought, and, indeed, strongly argued by Judeich and by E. M. Walker, in 1913,¹¹ that these echoes of P. in Diodorus proved that P. was Ephorus whom Diodorus was known to have utilised. But Diodorus had made some serious blunders, inexplicable even for Diodorus, if he were excerpting from a book at first-hand. The chronological order of events so crystal-clear in P. is more often than not muddled beyond recognition in Diodorus, for example, the events at Rhodes (P. ch.10, Diod. XIV. 79. 4-8.), and sometimes Diodorus gets the details quite wrong,

as when P. shows that Sparta was not the aggressor in 395, but Diodorus implies the opposite. (P. ch. 13; Diod. XIV. 81.1.). All this does little credit to the critical acumen of Diodorus. But the discovery of P. Oxy. 1610 changed all that. Diodorus's practice was now revealed in a truer light. He copied in the literal sense of the word. Diodorus used Ephorus at first hand, but was acquainted with P. only at second or third hand.

Besides revealing much of the methods of Diodorus and confirming much that we had already suspected, the Ephorus-papyrus enabled us to separate once and for all the Oxyrhynchus Historian from Ephorus. A further conclusion could also be drawn. The only satisfactory way of accounting for the similarities between P. and Diodorus which had caused all the original confusion was to accept that Ephorus himself made use of P., not quite in the manner in which he himself was now clearly shown to have been used or misused by Diodorus, but in the plagiarising way which appears to have been the general rule with ancient historians. But the fact remains that Ephorus, the debtor, with his Universal History, ousted from our literary record the name and almost even the memory of a first-class historian superior to himself by modern and Thucydidean standards. This thought cannot fail to produce dissatisfaction with the literary evidence and forcibly to drive home the hopelessness of *argumenta ex silentio auctorum*.

There is however another serious, if not knock-out blow that can be delivered against Ephorus. This concerns the implied contrast between the chronological system of Thucydidean summers and winters so obviously followed by P., and the "subject-system" adopted by Ephorus. It might seem obvious from what has been said before about Diodorus that if direct quotations from Ephorus are lacking elsewhere, we have a vast supply of the next best thing in those sections of the Universal Library of Diodorus where he is agreed by all to be directly using Ephorus as his main source. This is but deceptively true. For it is equally obvious that Diodorus was lacking in originality, even initiative.¹² What happens, then, when to meet the needs of Universal History in the late 1st century B.C., a Universal History of the 4th century B.C. has to be reduced in bulk by one-half? Diodorus was not the man to perform the surgical operation with any skill, especially when he has complicated matters for himself by purporting to adopt a strict annalistic framework—at least the beginnings and endings of years are noticed according to a variety of incompatible formulae, which are then placed on a Procrustean bed and made to coincide. The result is an incredibly confused and tortuous account of the whole

period from the Peloponnesian War to the siege of Perinthus, and beyond.

The *κατὰ γένος* method of Ephorus required the grouping of events round a central theme, events which may, and usually did, take several years to come to completion. Diodorus consistently incorporates these groups of events, compressing also the original fulness of narrative as he goes, into the space of a single archon or consular year. The chronological complexities may be imagined. Ephorus did have some sense of the passage of time, but Diodorus writes as if three or four years' campaigns really could and did take place in the same summer, or, if a small doubt strikes him, he chops the narrative diametrically in half and arbitrarily assigns the head to one year and the trunk to the next. Needless to say the precise tradition of Ephorus gets murdered in the process. What we do in fact possess of Ephorus, as transmuted by Diodorus, is not the clear, connected narrative we really need, but an assemblage of facts, opinions, attitudes that represent the Ephorus-tradition. Nor is it safe to assume that Diodorus himself did not from time to time venture to insert a well-pondered reflection of his own.

To return to P. and Ephorus, it must be said that, while the term *κατὰ γένος* without further definition is far too vague as a starting point for any higher criticism of Ephorus, yet it would have to be strangely modified to fit the Thucydidean 'diairesis' method exemplified in the papyrus. Nor is it conceivable that so admirably clear a narrative as P.'s could really be distorted so badly by a historian using him at first-hand, even if the historian were Diodorus.

It is not necessary to refute Theopompus' claims to the authorship of *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. The Philippica are so unlike P. in almost every respect that it was necessary to invent another, unreal, Theopompus as author of his *Hellenica*, of which P. was to be part. Even this device was quite illegitimate, as the two important fragments of Theopompus' *Hellenica* had to be disregarded.

From the preceding discussion some conclusions must be drawn, even if these are distastefully negative. The solution to the worrying question of the authorship of P. seems even further off than ever. The only possible candidate would be Cratippus, the strongest argument in whose favour is the very fact that a major historian is likely to be one of the 50 historians of the period whose names we know; Cratippus, the author without a History, offers a tantalising solution to the problem of the History without an author. Unfortunately what little does emerge about Cratippus does not tell in his favour. The possibility still has to be considered that

the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* comes from the pen of someone whose name we do not even know.

This, then, is the present state of our knowledge of 4th Century Greek historiography. Time and papyri cannot fail to bring some amelioration.

NOTES

¹ I am indebted to Mr G. T. Griffith, of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, for reading this paper and making several helpful suggestions. The bulk of the material was presented in a paper read to the Fifth Congress of the Association, February, 1957.

² F. Jacoby: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (F. Gr.H.), Part II (Leiden, 1926-30).

³ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. V, No. 842, pp.110-242.

F. Jacoby: F. Gr. H. II A. No. 66. pp.17-35 (Text); II C. pp.6-20 (Commentary).

⁴ F. Gr. H. II C. p.2; *Class. Quart.* XLIV (1950), p.6.

⁵ E. Schwartz: *Hermes* XLIV (1909) 496, quoted by Jacoby loc. cit.

⁶ Marcellinus. vit. Thuc. 45 (= Didymus). Diodorus Siculus XIV.84.7.

⁷ Vitae X Orat. 834 CD; Marcellinus, Vit. Thuc. 31-33.

⁸ *Classical Quarterly* N.S. IV (1954) p.53. Note that Plutarch's reference to Cratippus in *De Gloria Ath.* invalidates Assumption I.

⁹ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XIII. N. 1610 pp.98-127.

¹⁰ Examples quoted by H. Bloch in *Athenian Studies presented to W. Ferguson* (Harvard, 1940) pp.303-41, a valuable survey of the whole problem of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* till 1940. The new fragments in *Class. Quart.* XLIV (1950) pp.8-11 do not help towards a solution. See also G. T. Griffith in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (Blackwell, 1954), pp.160-162.

¹¹ E. M. Walker: *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (Oxford, 1913).

¹² No proofs are needed, but this quality is especially obvious when Diodorus is forced to change sources in mid-stream, e.g., the events of the Sacred War (Book XVI), when Ephorus failed him and Demophilus had to be used.

ASPECTS OF PORTUGUESE

B. W. ELLIS

Victoria University of Wellington

As Portuguese is not taught in Australasia, this article is intended to introduce the language as well as to comment on it: so it will contain a certain amount of somewhat elementary material. On the other hand, it can not be at all exhaustive, and seeks only to indicate the main characteristics of the vocabulary, and features of its phonetic development, beside the main peculiarities of the modern language, particularly in relation to French and English, some curiosities and current trends, of interest to language students.

VOCABULARY. Although the descendants of some classical Latin words such as *semper* and *ardere* are still used in most Romance languages, if not in French in these two cases, only the languages of the Iberian Peninsula (and to a lesser extent, Rumanian) have maintained a high proportion of classical vocabulary. For example, the everyday activity of eating is denoted in Portuguese and Spanish by *comer*, which represents the classical (compound) verb *comedere*, while French and Italian present descendants of a more expressive 'Vulgar' Latin verb *manducare*, meaning 'to masticate'; likewise the table is designated by *mesa* on the one hand, and by descendants of *tabula* on the other. Iberian Latin maintained *fervere*: 'to boil' while elsewhere the later verb *bullire* was developed. Even a pre-classical particle, the interrogative-relative possessive adjective *cuius*, having been transplanted to the early Roman colonies, survives with its relative function in modern Portuguese and Spanish.

On the other hand, the element of 'Vulgar' Latin here is not inconsiderable: e.g. *focus* and *caballus* were adopted here as elsewhere for 'fire' and 'horse'. The Portuguese and Spanish verbs 'to speak', *falar* and *hablar* represent the 'popular' verb *fabulare* (which contains the root of the old deponent verb *fari*), whereas in Gaul and Italy a Latinized Greek verb *parabolare* was adopted from the early Christian Church. Only the noun took root in the Iberian Peninsula with the meaning of 'word'. On the other hand, *cathedra* has given the word for 'chair' in Portuguese. The verb *arriver* in French originally meant 'come to the bank', but the Portuguese verb *chegar* and the Spanish *llegar* come from *plicare* meaning 'fold', and so 'tie up to the bank'. Likewise Iberia did not follow Gaul in applying *testa* to the human head; but for the leg it adopted *perna*: 'a ham'; and the descendants of *rostrum* come to have the occasional meaning of 'face'.

Although *ch(i)ef* remained an alternative to *teste* in Old French, and denotes a head person today, the Portuguese *cabo* took as principal meaning 'cape', and the human head is designated by *cabeça*, developed from *capitium*. On the whole, however, in the Southern languages, (where there is also less danger of homonymy, as final vowels are generally maintained) there are more simple words: e.g. Portuguese *sol* and *peito* contrasting with French *soleil* and *poitrine*. Similarly, *médico* and *músico* contrast with *médecin* and *musicien*. The diminutive of just one of a pair of similar words may be used: e.g. *ovelha* ('ewe'), beside *ovo* ('egg') and *abelha* (< *apicula*) beside *ave*. The usual word for bird in Portuguese is now *pássaro* from the Latin *passer(um)*, 'sparrow'. Something similar has happened in French where we find *œuf* and *ouaille*, the latter having finally been relegated to a figurative use by *brebis*.

There were several important developments in the Iberian Latin vocabulary. *Ter*, from *tenere*, became the verb 'to have', superseding the representative of *habere*, which served to form the new future tense, and which continues today (*haver* in Portuguese) as an impersonal verb corresponding to our use of 'there is', 'there are', etc. Beside the verb *ser* (< *essere* < *esse*), we find the development of *estar* from *stare* ('to stand') as a second verb 'to be', denoting position or temporary state. Although *ir* is still the general verb 'to go', there is now a second, more expressive verb *andar* (< *ambitare*), which expresses motion rather than movements. In Portuguese it is now used figuratively, and also the gerund *andando* following *ir* gives the meaning 'go along' or 'be going along'. The verb 'to go out' however (Port. *sair*, Span. *salir*) comes from *salire* (originally 'to leap').

There is little trace of Iberian vocabulary. However the word for 'left (hand, side)', *esquerdo* in Portuguese, was borrowed from Basque in place of the representatives of *sinister*. Several common words were also assimilated from Greek through contact with Greek colonies and merchants. The word for 'each' is *cada*, from the preposition *katá*, which also accounts for the *a* in the French *chacun*. *Cama*, presumably of Greek origin also, has displaced the descendants of *lectum* as the usual word for a bed. *Cara* is the usual word for the human face, though *chère* hardly survives in Modern French. *Face* is used in other cases in Modern Portuguese, and is currently the usual word for the cheek.

The small Germanic element in Portuguese is due mostly to the Visigoths. It includes notably several common words such as *guerra*, *guardar*, *esquivar*, *esquina* (meaning 'corner', while French *échine* means 'spine'), *branco* (< *blank*); also particular words like *elmo* (helmet) which have not been able to compete with local

words like *capacete* and *casco*. *Orgulho* (pride) is of Frankish origin, and *rico* was apparently borrowed through Provençal. *Caminho*, 'road' or 'way', is of Gallic origin. The Anglo-Saxon names for the points of the compass came through French after the XIIth century with the forms *norte*, *sul* (Span. *sur*), *oeste* and *este* (also *leste* in Portuguese only).

The Moorish occupation of the Peninsula imposed a number of words in Portuguese as in Spanish, particularly with commodities or concepts introduced: e.g. Port. *algodão* (cotton), *azeitona* (olive), *laranja* ('orange'—Span. *naranja*—from Persian *narang*), *azul* ('blue'—from the name of a precious stone), *amarelo* (yellow). *Alfândega*, meaning 'store' in Arabic, has been specialized as 'custom-house', and *armazém*, which has the Arabic article *al* changed to *ar*, and which denoted something in the nature of a barn, is used today for 'storehouse', 'warehouse', 'magazine', or 'store' in the American sense of a large shop. Cf. *magasin* in French, and 'magazine' in English. Later voyages, discoveries and trade brought other words from various sources.

In the modern period Portuguese has been enriched, like the other Romance languages and English, with numerous learned words of Latin and Greek origin. It has borrowed and adapted from French some words like *garagem*, *camião*, *avião*, *camionete*, *furgonete* and *champanhe*. Names of sports are *futebol*, *hóquei*, *râguebi*, etc., which need no comment. *Bar*, *clube* and *folclórico* (the last an adjective formed on the noun 'folklore') may have passed through French. The adaptation of French words was originally more complete: *camionnette* became *camioneta* and even *caminheta*, *champagne* became *champanha*, but the *e* ending now prevails. The form *camioneta* is still regularly used in the press, but it is always *camionete* that one hears. On the other hand, *bicicleta* maintains its Portuguese ending. *Táxi* suggests English influence by its accentuation; but the fact that a taxi-driver is a *chauf(f)eur* rather indicates that it came through French. *Táxi* has not completely ousted *carro*, which is still current, particularly at lower levels and in the expression *de carro* ('by taxi'). On the other hand, *chefe* was borrowed early with the meaning of 'chief', and so assimilated that an abstract noun *chefia* was formed from it.

In some cases, Portuguese has shown considerable independence, for although British men, companies and material have played a predominant part in the development of public transport, as well as communications, the ordinary vocabulary of the former domain, apart from *tún(n)el*, does not reflect this fact, (although *linha* may also possibly show foreign influence). Trains and trams are *comboios* ('convoys') and (*carros*) *eléctricos* respectively, and the rails

are *carris* (literally 'cart-tracks' or 'ruts'). *Carruagem*, used for a railway-carriage, is a local word meaning originally 'cart' or 'chariot'. Motor-buses and coaches are *autocarros* and *camionetes* (*de passageiros*) respectively. *Trem*, which is not a borrowing, and which corresponds to the French *train* (from *trahinare* derived from *trahere* in Vulgar Latin) has applications such as 'retinue'. It comes into railway technical terminology in *trem rodante* ('rolling stock') quoted by A. Elwes in his 'Portuguese Dictionary' (1920). J. W. Barker, in his 'Teach Yourself Portuguese' (1947) quotes *trem* as being used for a train in Brazil and a cab in Portugal. A book on Brazilian corroborates this point of Brazilian usage, but the Portuguese use of *trem* for 'cab' must be very limited, if a fact, because Elwes does not mention it, nor did I meet it in two years' recent residence in Lisbon. To denote a railway sleeper there is *dormiente* (perhaps a translation), but today one meets *chulipa*, which is simply a transposition of the English word in the Portuguese phonetic and orthographical system.

Other interesting borrowings are *bife*, which has the meaning of 'steak' (also 'Englishman' in *calão* or slang); *lanche*, which represents the English 'lunch' but means '(afternoon) tea'. *Sandwich* is used for something the same as or similar to the original; but its particular interest lies in the fact that there has come into existence a popular form *sandes* [sãdĩs] which is to be seen and heard in lower-class eating and drinking houses, and which must soon be officially recognized. *Filme* has practically replaced *fita* in the cinematographical sense, just as *lanche* prevails over *merenda*; a safety razor is a *gilete*; and the usual word for an arm-chair is now *maple* (pronounced as in English). *Dancing* is used as in France to denote a dance-hall or cabaret; *bar* may be used in the same way; and the French *boîte* is a '*chique*' designation for such an establishment, used out of *snobismo*. 'Lip-stick' is *baton*. *Recaut-chutagem* is now used as a technical term for the re-capping of tyres etc., (rubber is *borracha*); and *chauf(f)agem* (with *au* pronounced as in French) is used occasionally for household heating. In Brazil, apart from differences of usage, such as *trem* above, *ônibus*, and *bonde* for 'tram-car', and different currency, there is a further sub-stratum of native vocabulary. The borrowing of English and French from Portuguese is limited to *auto-da-fé* (literally 'act of faith'), and possibly *parasol*.

MORPHOLOGY. Morphologically, Portuguese still has much in common with Spanish: e.g. forms like *espada*, *vencer*, *vendedor*, *sedoso*, *real*, *triste*, *tratado*, *ponte* belong to both languages. Both dropped final *e* after *r* and *l*, and have no analogical feminine for the endings *-ar*, and *-al*, which represent *-are(m)*, and *-ale(m)*, but

add *-a* to *-or* as in Port. *senhora*. The Latin noun ending *-tate(m)* becomes *-dade* in Portuguese (exc. *vontade* < *voluntatem*), though *-tad* and *-dad* in Spanish. Otherwise the two have final vowels and initial (prosthetic) *e* in common. They have two grammatical genders, and form plurals with (*e*)*s*, having in fact, despite their general conservatism, used only the accusative case from the Latin declension.

Verbs are in three main groups ending in *-ar*, *-er*, *-ir*. The term 'conjugation' is somewhat inapposite, as in Latin: the endings generally suffice to distinguish the persons, and pronouns do not normally accompany verb-forms except for emphasis or clarity. The Latin third 'conjugation', with its unstressed *-ere* ending, was assimilated to the second, giving *defender*, *colher* (< *colligere*) etc. in Portuguese. In some cases the change continued to *-ir*, as with *fingir* < *fingerere*; but this happened less in Portuguese than in Spanish: cf. *dizer* with *decir*. Portuguese has restored *poer* to *pôr*, which represents the original *ponere*. (cf. French *pondre* and Spanish *poner*). In the *-ar* group there are descendants of a number of 'popular' Latin verbs formed on the supine stem of classical verbs of the 3rd conjugation. There is in Portuguese *pousar* beside *pôr* (cf. French *poser*) and *acreditar* beside *crer*. Although *pôr* is still the usual verb 'to put', *crer* is now restricted to uses like *creio que sim* (cf. Fr. *je crois que oui*), 'I believe so' or 'I think so'. Other classical verbs like *canere* and *iungere* disappeared before the ancestors of *cantar* and *juntar*. *Finire* and *manere* gave *fir* and *maer*, but these were driven out of Old Portuguese by *acabar* and *fi(n)car*.

As elsewhere the present participle took the form of the gerund and the endings *-ente* and *-ante* are found only in adjectives and nouns. A few classical perfect participles survive in *feito*, *dito*, *visto*. Otherwise Portuguese perfect participles all end in *-ado* or *-ido*. However *aceite* (< *acceptum*) and *pago* are regularly used instead of *aceitado* and *pagado* in an adjectival function, i.e. after a verb 'to be': e.g. *está aceite*: 'it has been (lit. 'is') accepted.'

Though Portuguese has much in common with Spanish, it has a number of quite distinctive developments. Here, initial *f* is retained instead of being changed to *h*, in turn muted, as in Spanish (though the initial *g* of *germanus* has disappeared in *irmão* as in *hermano*, 'brother'); likewise medial *ct* becomes *it* and not *ch*. Here, as in no other Romance language, *l* after a consonant commonly changes to *r*, and intervocalic *l* and *n*, as well as (original) *d* and *g* commonly disappear. Portuguese, like others but not Spanish, includes *s* in the voicing of intervocalic consonants, though the spelling does not change except in a case like *igreja* < *ecclesia*. Portuguese maintains stressed *e* and *o* where they are diphthongized

in Spanish (or French): cf. *sete* with Sp. *siete*, *ovo* with Sp. *huevo*, French *œuf*. On the other hand it is distinguished, notably from Spanish, by diphthongs such as *ei*, *oi*, *ou*.

The Latin *-arius* ending gives *-eiro* in Portuguese, while the pure vowel is restored in the Modern Spanish *-ero*. Likewise *feria* gives *feira*; but this diphthong does not evolve as in French (except for being opened to (aĩ) in the speech of the uneducated.) When there is no metathesis, the diphthong often occurs where a palatal consonant (or *p*) has disappeared before another consonant: e.g. *factu(m)* gives *feito* (cf. Span. *hecho*), *acceptare* gives *aceitar*. Where a *d* or *n* had disappeared in the early language leaving a hiatus, a 'yod' eventually came in if the first vowel was *e*: e.g. *feio* < *foedu(m)*, *ceia* < *cena(m)*. Cf. *meio* < *mediu(m)*, *suar* < *sudare*, *cena* < *scaena*, *pena* < *poena*, and *cadeira* (< *cathedra*), where the *i* actually replaces the *d*. The diphthong has no obvious explanation in a number of cases such as *seiva* (*sapa*), *teima* (*thema*). In the plural of words ending in *l* we find various diphthongs containing *i*, although till recently most of them were spelt with *e*: e.g. *animais*, *móveis*, *lençois*, *azuis*. Similarly *multum* has given *multo*.

Examples of the disappearance of *l* are *magoar* < *maculare*, *escada* ('stair-case' or 'ladder') < *scalata*, *doer* < *dolere*, *mau* < *malu(m)*, *má* < *mala(m)*. *Só* (*solum*) is today both masculine and feminine adjective and also commonly adverb. The *l* remains in *mal* from *male*. *Fila* must be 'learned' or a loan-word: cf. *fio*, *fiar*.

The disappearance of *n* has resulted in contraction in cases like *vir* < *venire*, *padaria* < *panataria*. It left the preceding vowel nasal, but the pronunciation is now 'pure' in words like *Lisboa*, *lua*, *soar* (*sonare*). When the following vowel is close, that syllable drops completely. So *bonu(m)* gives *bom* and *bene*, *bem*, while *bona(m)* gives *boa*. The endings *-anu(m)* and *-ane(m)* give *-ão* and *-ãe*. However, in the modern period the ending *-ão* is generalized, replacing *-ãe* and *-om* in the singular (not in words like *bom* where *-om* is part of the radical making plurals irregular. For example, *cão* (*canem*) has the plural *cães*; *camião* (Fr. *camion*) has *camiões*, while *mão* (*manum*) has *mãos*. Likewise the feminine of the augmentative ending *-ão* is *-ona*. The *n* remains in modern words like *plano*, a 'plan', and the ending *-ano* denoting nationality: *italiano*, *americano*, etc., while the old name *Alemannu(m)* is represented by *Alemão* (fem. *Alemã*; plurals *Alemães*, *Alemãs*). The endings *-çao*, *-sao*, *zao* have become the universal representatives of *-tione(m)*, *(-cionem)* and *sione(m)*, the 'yod' sound being preserved only in *paixão*, where *x* is pronounced [ʃ], and *ocasião* (cf. *igreja*); exx. *condição*, *nação*, *missão*, *tensão*, *razão*. We find *-ião* after other consonants, as in *religião*, *opinião*. The original descendant of

palatium is *paço*, now found only in proper names, while a palace is denoted by the modern word *palacio*. The representatives of the *-antia* and *-entia* endings have no *i* in words like *segurança* and *doença*, besides others like *circunstância*, and *conferência*, which are presumably of more recent formation. French presents similar cases such as the doublet *rançon*: *rédemption*.

Common examples of the change of *l* to *r* are *branco*, *praia* (< *plaga*), *praça* (Latin *platea*, Sp. *plaza*, Fr. *place*, It. *piazza*), *nobre* (representing *nobile(m)*, though such words usually have a *-vel* ending in Portuguese today), *cravo* (*clauum*), *frasco*. The French *papier* became *papel* (Port. and Sp.) in transmission by Catalan. *Escravo* has the 'parasitic' *c* found elsewhere in *esclave*, etc. The *d* of *humilde* is perhaps due to the *-dade* ending, but that of *rebelde* (also Sp.) is more problematical. The extra *r* in *estrela* is no doubt due to *astrum*.

An original *r* in the medial group tended to be transposed as we see in *fresta*, the descendant of *fenestra*, specialized in the meaning of 'sky-light', and in *prego* from (Greek) *epigrus*; cf. also *rosto* which represents *rostrum*. Before *s* an *r* sometimes disappeared to give, e.g., *pessoa* from *persona*, *pêssego* from *persica*.

An alternative treatment of the groups *cl*, *pl*, *fl*, which prevailed in a number of cases, was *ch* (while Spanish developed *ll*). Examples are *chamar* < *clamare*, *chave* < *clauē(m)*, *chão* < *planu(m)*, *cheio* < *plenu(m)*, *chumbo* < *plumbu(m)*, *chama* < *flamma*. Compare *cheirar* (to smell) with Fr. *flairer*, and *flagrant(e)* and *fragrant(e)*, which appear in most of the Romance languages. *Flor* has triumphed over variants *frol* and *chor*.

Two curious cases are the development of *parabola* and *mira-culu(m)*, where dissimilation following the change of *l* to *r* interchanged the original liquid consonants, giving *palavra* and *milagre* (compare *perigo* < *periculum*, *povo* < *populum*, *macho* < *mas-culum*). The representative of *anima* is *alma*, through differentiation, the same process having given *arme* in Old French. Dissimilation also gave *lembrar* from *rememorare*, although the same has not happened in the case of *regra* (< *regula*) or *Fevereiro* or *peregrino* (cf. Fr. *pèlerin*). A group like *-rar* is maintained in *raro* and in verbs, such as *parar*, *chorar* (< *plorare*), *corar* (< *colorare*), *ladrar*, *crer*, *cobrir*, *rir*. In recent words we find *l* preserved and even the ending *-ulo*: e.g. *plano* (cf. *chão*, *praia*, etc.), *duplo* (cf. *dobrar*), *século*, *capítulo*, (cf. Fr. *siècle*, *chapitre*; also *povoação*, *til*, and the learned words *população*, and *título*).

Another unique feature of Portuguese is the loss of (initial) *l* in the descendants of *illum* etc., which serve as definite articles and pronouns: *o*, *os*, *a*, *as*. The *l* appears today only in cases of con-

traction with loss of a preceding final *r*, such as *pelo*, or when there is an enclitic pronoun object attached to a verb form normally ending in *r*, *s*, or *z* (the last two are pronounced [z] before a following vowel): e.g. *encontrá -la*, *damo -los*, *fa -lo*, from *encontrar*, *damos*, and *faz*. The final *m* that we see in *bom*, *bem*, *um*, etc. is also characteristic, and the forms *mim* and *assim* (Fr. *moi*, *ainsi*) are unique. The *m*, which nasalizes the preceding vowel, as does *n*, is silent. It changes to *n* in spelling before *s* of the plural. We find also *nh* and *lh* representing the palatalized sounds represented in Spanish by *ñ* and *ll*. For example, the Latin *montanea* has become *montanha*, *balneo* > *banho*, *filia* > *filha*, (cf. Sp. *hija*), *speculu(m)* > *espelho*, etc. The Portuguese *família*, (Spanish also), is exceptional, having a learned form, like *auxílio*. There is no palatal in the etymology of *vinho*, *caminho*, *espinho*, which moreover have a plain *n* in other languages.

The diphthongs *oi* and *ou* need to be considered apart because of the particular instability and confusion of their relationship, which is still in evidence today. It is not very surprising to find *coiro* representing *coriu(m)*, or *noite* representing *nocte(m)*; but *doutor* ('doctor') shows the complication, viz. that *oi* was once generally assimilated to *ou*, which represents notably Latin *au* and *al*, as *ouro* < *auru(m)*, and *outro* < *alteru(m)*. So in books of several decades ago we find *couro* and *noute* beside *oito*. (The original descendant of *actum* is likewise *auto*). But now the pendulum has swung back, and by differentiation *ou*, regardless of origin, has commonly become *oi*, the spelling following the pronunciation. Today, such forms as *noite*, *coisa* (< *causa*), *boi* (< *bouem*), *dois* (< *duos*), are firmly established; *toiro* is now usual, though not mentioned in Elwes' Dictionary in 1920; *ouro* is hardly found apart from names, likewise *couro* subsists beside *coiro*, but I have heard only the latter pronunciation.

The form *ou* remains in *outro*, *pouco* (< *paucum*), *roupa* (linen), *louco* ('mad'—less used today than *doido*), *souto* ('thicket—cf. learned word *salto*); but it is now pronounced [o]—cf. Spanish *otro*, etc. The endings *-ouro*, *-oura* have a slightly more open vowel except in Oporto and a few other districts, (although *r* does not open *e* at all), and this no doubt explains their considerable resistance, in spite of their origins, to the change (back) to *oi*. The stressed verb endings *-ou*: e.g. *dou*, *sou* (< *sum*), *falou* (< *fabulauit*) are unchallenged, likewise *trouxe* [tros] in the past tense of *trazer*. However among the tense forms of *ouvir* (< *audire*) we find today *oiço* (pres. indic.) and *oiça*, *oiças*, etc. (pres. subj.) beside *ouve*, *ouves*, etc. The unstressed syllable has not changed

from *ou* except in *oiçamos*. Compare *ouvimos*, *ourives* (goldsmith), *outeiro* (< *altarium*), *doutor* (doctor).

PHONETICS. The pronunciation of today presents a number of interesting features. The most striking perhaps is the palatalization of final *s* and *z*, of *s* before a consonant in any position, and commonly of *x* (pronounced [ʃ] like *ch*). The frequent occurrence of the 'sh' sound (at least once in every plural word not followed by a vowel) is apt to lead to wrong conclusions.

In some words, mostly of recent creation or borrowing, *x* has the [ks] pronunciation: e.g. *táxi*, *anexo*, *crucifixo*, *fixar*. In some others of longer standing it is [s] between vowels: e.g. *próximo*, *auxílio*. In the prefix *-ex* it is [z] before a vowel, the same as intervocalic *z* and *s*.

There are several varieties of *r*, the main ones being a strongly trilled one used for *r* at the beginning of a word (or radical as in *obrigado*) and for *rr* between vowels, and a lighter sound of similar nature for final and intervocalic *r*. Between vowels the *r*, being alveolar, often sounds like an English *d*, while on the other hand, particularly in popular speech, final *r* is often trilled considerably, with the result that an indeterminate vowel (unstressed *e*) is heard after it. This leads to confusion also of the prefixes *per-* and *pre-*. For *rr* and initial *r* a guttural rolled pronunciation, originally regional, seems to be spreading very considerably.

A strong stress accent makes Portuguese unique among the Romance languages. It causes closing of unstressed vowels. Unstressed *a* is similar to the indeterminate vowel in the middle of 'catapult'. The close vowel is found even in stressed syllables before *m* and *nh*. Unstressed *e* is still more closed, approaching [ø], and unstressed *o* is pronounced [u]. This sound and unstressed *e* are often swallowed to the extent of virtual disappearance. The prosthetic *e* is pronounced [ɪ] and barely heard. But in the conjunction *e* and before a stressed vowel the sound is [i] or a semi-consonant. The stressed syllable is generally the last before the vowel-ending (any intervening vowel in Latin having disappeared.) There is a slight secondary accent on the radical of a long word, but not enough to open the vowel.

There are two stressed *e*'s, one close and one open, likewise two *o*'s. There are however only two *a*'s in all, the close stressed *a* in *cama* and *banho* being the same, apart from the stress and slight nasalization, as the unstressed one in *chamar* and *banhar*. Nasal vowels are common, and there is some nasalization of the preceding vowel even when the consonant is fully pronounced. The *i* of *muito* has been 'infected' by the *m* in recent times. The nasal vowels have not opened or evolved as in French, but are still [ĩ], [ẽ].

[ū], [ã]. This last has if anything closed, generally sounding like French *in*. However, final *em* is both open and diphthongized today. This pronunciation, with or without nasal, is extended to *e* in the speech of all classes in Lisbon in words like *tenho*, *sexto*, before palatal sounds which require a close vowel in the 'national' pronunciation. The unstressed verb-ending (3rd person) *am* is pronounced like *ão*. *L* is velar in final position or before a consonant, as in English; and even between vowels, a velar element can be heard preceding the gingival or 'alveolar'. Intervocalic *d* is no longer explosive, and sounds like 'th' in English.

In Brazilian Portuguese, unstressed vowels do not close, or close much less, and final *e* is pronounced [ɨ]; *s* and *z* are not palatalized, though *t* and *d* often are when followed by a front vowel. In the ending *em*, the *e* tends to remain close and not be diphthongized.

The stress is, as I have mentioned, on the syllable bearing the accent in Latin. What is now considered 'normal' stress in Portuguese is on the penult in words like *rosa(s)*, *falo*, *cantam* (< *cantant*), *fantasia(s)*, *bilhete(s)*, and on the final syllable when it ends with a consonant, a diphthong or a nasal vowel, e.g. *animal*, *cantei* (< *cantaui*), *maçã* (cf. Span. *manzana*), *ração* (< *rationem*). In such cases no written accent is used today except to distinguish an open *e* in an *eu* ending: cf. *chapéu*, *céu*, with *seu*, *pareceu*; or on a stressed final syllable which is similar to a plural noun or verb ending: e.g. *além*, *também*, *inglês*; cf. *vendem*, the plural *pobres* and the semi-learned adjective *simples* (< *simplex*). These two orthographical accents denote stress. The commoner is the 'acute', used on *i* and *u*, and on *a*, *e*, and *o* when the vowel sound is open; the 'circumflex' denotes an equally stressed but relatively close *e*, *o* or *a*. They are written when the stress is in an 'abnormal' position, e.g.: *família*, *prático*, *cómodo*, *farmácia*, *ânsia* (the nasal *a* represented by *an* is relatively close).

There is often an open vowel in an unstressed syllable, particularly in learned words. Scientific terms are obvious cases: common cases are *ordinário* (which is marked as 'learned' by its ending), *normal* and *ocupar*. The prefix *ob* has an open vowel when followed by a consonant as in *obrigado*. An open vowel is also indicated by a following *c* or *p* (usually silent) before another consonant; e.g. *baptista*, *adoptar*, *contração*, *direcção*. Exceptions are *acção* and *actual*, which have a close *a*. After an initial *h* (silent), *o* is open, as in *horror*, but other vowels are not. *Padeiro* ('baker') and *geração* (generation) have an open vowel in the first syllable representing the fusion of two vowels resulting from the disappearance of an *n*. However, in the adjective *geral*, the *e* remains closed, the same as in the 'learned' noun, *general*. *Caveira* ('skull'—from

calvaria) has open *a*, the explanation being indicated by the Spanish *calavera*.

The use of the 'circumflex' accent in the 'normal' position to distinguish a close vowel having generally been abandoned in recent years in Portugal, the study of the language is complicated considerably, for there is notable conflict between the inherited pronunciation of vowels, depending on their origin, and the influence of vowel endings. The ending *-o* tends to close a vowel, particularly *o*, or to keep it closed, while *-a* does the opposite, except in verbs. So the Latin *i* gives two different *e*'s in the pronouns and demonstratives *ele* and *ela*, *este* and *esta*, etc., and there is a double distinction, in pairs of words formed on one radical, between *bola* and *bolo*, between *copa* and *copo*. There is however a further complication in the fact that in the plural even of masculine words, the stressed vowel is open. So there is also a difference in the stressed vowel between *osso* and *ossos*, etc. The stressed vowel of *louca* also tends to be opened, but *todo* keeps its close vowel in the feminine and plural. However, *e* in adjectives and pronouns is not generally affected by gender or number endings. The stressed close vowel of *mesmo* (< *metip-simum*) remains close in *mesma* and *mesmos*, while it is open in *belo*, *bela* and *belos*. In a verb like *dever*, the stressed vowel is close in *devo* and *deva*, but open in *deve* and *devem*, (though the stressed *o* in forms of *poder* is always open.) It is only the open *e* that is diphthongized. Palatal and nasal consonants normally require a close vowel before them, but in Lisbon words like *espelho*, *tenho* (< *teneo*), *veja* (< *video*), *texto*, are today all commonly pronounced with the diphthong, while in the 'national' pronunciation all have a close *e*. Generally Latin *i*, long *e*, *ae* and *oe* give the close *e* in Portuguese; for example *vez*, which comes from *vici*s, *cabelo* from *capillu(m)*, *sede* from *siti(m)*, *mesa* from *mensa(m)*, *pena* from *poena(m)*, *cena* from *scaena(m)*, and the endings *-ês* from *-ense(m)*, its analogical feminine *-esa*, and *-eza* from *-itia*.

Latin short *e*, *u* and short *o*, give an open *e* and *o* respectively, as in *belo*, *pé*, *logo*, *pote*, *rosa*. Exceptions are the open vowels in *prémio* (< *praemium*), *débil* (< *debilem*), *móvel* (< *mobilem*), *nobre*, *cheio* (< *plenum*), *feio* (< *foedum*). Adjectives like *seco*, *seca*, and nouns like *gosto* and *jogo* are distinguished by a close stressed vowel (hereditary in the first three cases, induced in the last) from otherwise identical forms of the related verbs *secar*, *gostar* and *jogar*, which have the stressed vowel open.

Two common diacritical signs are the *til* or 'tilde', used to mark

the nasal *a* when it is the ending or part of a diphthong (elsewhere *m* and *n* are written, being pronounced only before bilabial and dental consonants respectively) and the *cedilha* or 'cedilla' indicating the pronunciation of the 'soft' *c*, that is [s], before *a* or *o*. There is also a 'grave' accent, which marks the open *a* resulting from the fusion of the preposition *a* (unstressed) and the following feminine definite article *a*, which is also unstressed. This pronunciation is regular when there are two successive unstressed *a*'s, in for example *para a cama* or *a amiga*; but the spelling *à* is used only when the two vowels are those two detached morphemes.

SPELLING. The spelling of Portuguese has been emended, and in particular simplified, in recent years. *S* or *ss* has been restored in some words like *pêssego* and *cansar*, *pesar* and *mês*, where the etymology had been obscured by their spelling with *ç* and *z* (these latter involving Latin *c* or *t*.) Intervocalic *y* has been replaced by *i* as in *comboio*. The letter *o* is confirmed as representing the short [u] in the unstressed syllables of most words, such as *trovoada* and verbs like *chover*, which have *o* also when the radical is stressed as in *chove* (cf. the noun *chuva*). A verb which has *u* in the stressed radical generally maintains it: e.g. *chupar*; cf. also *povoação* and the learned word *população*. After non-nasal vowels however, the ending *o* has been changed back to *u*, presumably to distinguish better words like *mau* and *pau* from others like *mão* and *pão*. The spelling is made more phonetic by the change of *ae* to *ai* and *oe* to *oi*. The *e* remains however if the first vowel is nasal, also in the conjunction *e*, in several words like *teatro* and *veado*, and in the *-ear* verb ending, beside *criar* and *criado*, *criada*.

The reverse change has been made in *semelhante*, and there is probably a certain amount of confusion between the prefixes *dis-* and *des-*, (the latter representing in some cases at least, a hypothetical *de ex* in Vulgar Latin). The vowel of the unstressed first syllable of *ministro* and *visita* is also pronounced as if it were an *e*, but the spelling is maintained. By way of simplification, *ph* has been replaced by *f*, and *th* by *t*; double consonants have been reduced in most cases. *Ss* is retained to preserve the voiceless pronunciation, and *rr* which also represents a different sound from *r*. The *h* introduced in the spelling between vowels in hiatus is now eliminated as in *sair* or *ái* (though in the latter case it is in fact etymological). Initial *h*, (also silent) remains. It indicates the open *o* in the unstressed syllable of words like *horror*, but does not affect other vowels. It does serve in the case of *haver* to distinguish the inflected forms *há* and *houve* more clearly from other morphemes. It is unnecessary also in *hórrido*, and disappeared from *aborrecer*, allowing the vowel to close, long before the revision took place.

Aspects of Portuguese

Silent *c* and *p* are retained in words like *contracção*, *direcção*, *baptista*, *adoptar*, to indicate an open vowel. The first *c* is pronounced in *secção*, perhaps as an extra distinction from *sessão*. In *acção* and *actual* however, the *c* is silent and the vowel closed.

So the spelling is still far from being completely phonetic. Apart from the cases mentioned above, there are a number of open vowels in unstressed syllables which are not indicated. There is now generally no indication of the quality of a vowel in the normal stressed position. Between vowels, the old spelling *ll* was actually more phonetic, as there are two elements in the pronunciation. The reduction of double consonants in words like *inocencia* and *imenso* obscures their composition and their relationship with other words. If they are likened to *indecente* and *impróprio* their radicals will appear to have no initial consonant and not be connected with *nocivo* and *mensurar*. The generalization of *o* in place of *u* in the unstressed syllable restores or preserves the etymology in some cases like *poder*, though obscures it in others such as *correr* and *dobrar*, which are thus further separated from *curso* and *duplo*.

The vocabulary remains, despite learned words and some modern borrowings, relatively poor and lacking a number of distinctions, particularly in the usage of today and in comparison with English. *Substituir por* represents 'substitute for' and 'replace with (by)'; *cheio de*, both 'full of' and 'covered with'; *camionete* is used for both 'motor-lorry' and 'motor-coach', the qualifying phrases *de carga* and *de passageiros* being generally omitted. The classical verb *amar* has disappeared from all but literary language, *gostar (de)* being used for both 'like' and 'love': cf. *aimer* in French. *Esperar* translates 'hope (for)', 'wait (for)', and 'expect', (though *aquardar* exists for the last). *Tremar* is commonly supposed to be the only verb for 'tremble', 'shiver', 'quiver', etc., though actually *tiritar* and *tremular* also exist; *convencer* is used for 'convince' and 'persuade' to the exclusion of *persuadir*; *escutar* 'listen (to)' is commonly replaced by *ouvir*, 'hear'; *principalmente* practically excludes *especialmente*. *Sair* is used not only for 'go out', but also for 'go away (for some time)' and 'leave', *partir* being practically limited to the meaning of 'break' despite *a partir de* (cf. French) and *partida* (departure). 'Go away' otherwise is *ir (se) embora*. There is also *embora*, 'however', which also translates 'although', being used as a regular conjunction today. *Achar* ('find') used in the abstract domain with the meaning of 'think', 'be of opinion', like the French *trouver*, is generally restricted to that meaning, the idea of 'find' in the concrete sense being covered by *encontrar* ('meet').

Demasiado and *demasiadamente* are rarely heard today, being

replaced by *muito*. The concept of 'too (much)' is no longer a current one, has been relegated to the 'passive' vocabulary, and is in danger of extinction. There is a lack of expression of aspect in tenses and in the participial adjective *divertido*. The imprecision of the latter type is extended to *aborrecido*, which was listed in 1920 with the literal meanings of 'abhorred, detested', but which is used today with a range of meanings extending from 'annoyed' and 'annoying' on one hand, to 'bored' and 'boring' on the other. Convenient simplifications belonging to all levels of the language are *pais* ('fathers') for 'parents', and *tios* for 'uncle and aunt'. However *filhos* for 'children', 'offspring' is a little ambiguous.

There is also some tendency to lose the distinction between *todo* and *inteiro*, which corresponds to that between 'all' and 'whole'. There is the use of *mandar* in the construction 'to have something done'. Commonly, however, the distinction between for example 'cutting one's hair' and 'having one's hair cut' is not made, *cortar os cabelos* serving in both cases. There is also no distinction between the artisan and his establishment except in a few cases where there is a derivative like *alfaiataria*: 'tailor's-shop'. 'At the barber-shop' or 'at the hairdresser's' is translated by *no barbeiro* or *no cabeleireiro*. The meaning of *curso* ('course') is today extended to the diploma received: *Tirar um curso* for example, means 'to take a degree'. The adjective *imenso* gives also a colloquial adverb; and on the analogy of *muito* and *muitas horas*, etc., one hears *imensas horas*, etc. with the meaning of the latter.

The use of the past imperfect tense for the conditional is perhaps a survival or a revival rather than a corruption—cf. English 'I had rather', 'you had better' etc. 'Should' and 'ought' are rendered in academic language by the conditional, *deveria*, etc., of *dever* ('owe'), as in French: *je devrais*, etc. The colloquial language not only uses the imperfect tense *devia*, etc. with this meaning, but often uses the present *devo* etc., so destroying the distinction between 'must' and 'ought'.

On the other hand there are two verbs 'to dry': *enxugar* (transitive) and *secar* (intrans.), and a clear distinction between *de regresso*, 'on the way back' and *de volta* (Fr. *de retour*), which means '(having arrived) back'. There is originality in the formation of *estranhar*: 'to wonder (at), etc.' (also in Spanish), *dificultar* (opposed to *facilitar*), and *chefiar* 'to head, lead'. At the 'journalese' level notably there is a marked propensity to use new verbs formed with the *-ear* ending on adjectives, the extreme case being probably *rarear* 'to be(come) rare'.

Ca is regularly used in the colloquial language (as in Old French) instead of *aqui* to translate 'here' ('hither') with a verb of move-

ment; and for 'come here' one hears not only *Vem cá* but *anda cá*. I have heard even *chegar* ('arrive') used for 'go'. *Aonde* ('whither') is on one hand being replaced by the simple *onde*, and on the other *aonde* is sometimes used for 'where'.

One of the meanings of *importar* is 'to matter.' From the impersonal type of expression with an indirect object, the usage of today has made a reflexive verb: 'I don't mind' is *Não me importo*. (Cf. French *se souvenir*). *Vossa mercê*, originally an honorific substitute for 'you', like *Vossa Excelência*, is now used, in the abbreviated form *você* to address equals or inferiors.

Pois, which comes from Latin *postius* and corresponds to the French *puis*, means 'then'. In its use as a conjunction today the relationship between two clauses is reversed, and *pois* is equivalent to 'for'. This word has long been used as an alternative for *sim* ('yes') and also as an assertive re-inforcing element with *sim* and *não*, like *mais* in French. *Pois não?* is also used when the speaker seeks confirmation of his statement, but with a little more confidence than if he uses *não é?*, (cf. Fr. *n'est-ce pas?*) and expects the reply *pois é* or *é, é*.

'Diminutive' endings are applied with affective value to many categories of words colloquially: e.g. *adeusinho* ('goodbye') *bonzinho* ('good') *obrigadinha*. In many cases, such as the last, *pertinho* ('near') *sòzinho* ('alone')—('lonely') and *pequenino* ('tiny'), they actually intensify the meaning, and some of these forms are 'recognised' words. In the North of Portugal, the 'diminutive' is the normal form of most nouns.

The definite article which accompanies names of countries, is omitted with *Portugal* unless it is qualified, and may be omitted with *França* and *Inglaterra*. Colloquially it is used with people's names when referred to, e.g. *O João, a Maria, o Ferreira. O que* tends to replace *que* as the interrogative pronoun. The stressed form *o quê?* is also common.

The verb *dar* has some curious idiomatic uses. The most curious is *dar lições* meaning 'to have (take) lessons' as well as 'to give lessons'. *Dar uma volta* corresponds to the French *faire un tour*; and 'to go round the world' is *dar a volta ao mundo*, the preposition *a* being used even when there is no verb: e.g. *A Volta à França*: The 'Tour de France'.

I have already mentioned two tendencies in pronunciation: the use of the open diphthong for *e* before palatals in Lisbon, and the popular opening of the first element of *ei* to the sound of *a*. *nh* in popular speech is treated as a simple nasal consonant before a consonant, i.e. it disappears, leaving the vowel nasal. So *vinho tinto* is pronounced as 'vintinto', and *tenho que . . .* in Lisbon is pro-

nounced the same as *tem que* . . . There is also a marked tendency to drop completely the palatalized *s* before a consonant. '*Tá bem*' for '*está bem*' is 'all right' and is particularly common, extending to all classes of society. Likewise one may hear *a me'ma coisa*, or *mai' nada* for 'no(thing) more' or 'nothing else'.

The development of the pronunciation of *muíto* is typical of that of certain diphthongs today. As the *i* replaced an *l* the diphthong must have been originally stressed on the first vowel, and the second must have been a semi-consonant. But the pronunciation today is [mwît(u)], while the 'popular' [mût(u)] is nearer to the original. In verb forms ending in *-iu* the *i* is theoretically a full vowel bearing the stress the same as the *e* of the *-eu* ending, and the *i* of the *-ia* endings. However, in practice today the stress falls on the second element of the diphthong *iu*, the first being a semi-consonant. In *período* and *míope* this change gives the anomaly of a stressed *o* pronounced [u].

To conclude the survey of this rich and little explored field of study, I will mention the curious ways of expressing prices that a visitor to the country must know. The unit of currency is the *escudo* which is divided theoretically into *centavos*, the smallest coin being the '10 centavo' piece, known as a *tostão*. In practice this latter and the *real* (a 1000th of an *escudo*) are still the main units used. So 1 \$ 50 is normally expressed as either *quinze (tostões)* or *mil e quinhentos (réis)*. In higher prices the form is e.g. *sete (escudos) e quinhentos* or *sete e meio (7½)*. *Um conto*, which is used for 1,000 *escudos* meant originally 1,000,000 *réis*. Practically the only case in which *centavos* are ever used in the spoken language is that of postage stamps, which may be designated according to the figures printed on them.

The maintenance of traditional monetary units in the spoken language today illustrates the conservatism that has dominated the formation of Portuguese. We have seen this especially in the preservation of a considerable amount of classical vocabulary, and in the rigorous use of the future subjunctive (although this latter is actually of 'popular' Latin origin). Moreover, in its isolated situation, Portuguese has to some extent not only escaped but resisted outside influence: loan-words do not represent a great part of its vocabulary. Some of its features are paradoxical: several phonetic developments, notably, are extreme, and unusual if not unique. The current trends in usage are perhaps due to the ascendancy of the 'bourgeoisie' since the revolution of 1910. They may already be considered part of the 'living' language, and appear likely to impose themselves permanently.

SEVENTY YEARS IN THE HISTORY OF GOETHE'S 'URFAUST' (1887-1957)

D. R. COVERLID

University of Melbourne

By the publication of the Göchhausen manuscript of Goethe's 'Urfaust' in photostat copy (in Volume I of *Werke Goethes*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1954, edited by Ernst Grumach), the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin has earned the gratitude of Goethe scholars everywhere. For the first time in the seventy years since Erich Schmidt discovered the manuscript among the papers of Fräulein von Göchhausen in Dresden, it is now possible for those who have no access to the Weimar archives, but who wish to consult it, to do so virtually at first hand and to examine for themselves the handwriting in which the *Faust* scenes in their original form have been preserved. Erasures and corrections are clearly visible and show that, in spite of some mistakes, the copy was carefully made in a neat hand. In addition to the 94 photostat pages, the edition contains the text of 'Urfaust' in ordinary print and the text of *Faust: ein Fragment* on facing pages. It is a plain text, without introduction or notes.

The printed text of 'Urfaust' in this volume is closer to the original manuscript than any that has yet been published. All the idiosyncrasies of spelling,¹ punctuation and arrangement have been faithfully copied. It is true that a few misprints have crept in (a space between lines 85 and 86, though the manuscript runs straight on; l. 128. *In* for *Ich*; l. 161. *verschwindt* for *verschwindet*; l. 966, a comma after *schwindet*), and that some obvious errors have been corrected without explanation (l. 68, *genug* for *genung*; l. 88, *würkende* for *winkende*; l. 539, *Mädgen* for *Madgen*; l. 871. *Den* for *Denn*; l. 924, *Überdruss* for *Uberdruss*; l. 1123 *Über* for *Uber*). Elsewhere, deviations from the manuscript have been indicated by brackets around the letters or words supplied, so that a reader can see at a glance how the original reads. In copying the Earth Spirit's description of its own activities, for instance, Frä. von Göchhausen inadvertently jumped from one line into the next, omitting three words; the passage is shown thus:

ll. 153-155: Ein ewiges Meer
 Ein wechselnd [Weben
 Ein glühend] Leben!

In Mephisto's Song of the Flea in Auerbach's Cellar, two lines were omitted in the middle of the third verse, which is printed thus:

Und Herrn und Fraun am Hofe
Die waren sehr geplagt,
[Die Königin und die Zofe
Gestochen und genagt]
Und durften sie nicht knicken, . . .

The missing words are also supplied in the scene that was subsequently headed *Trüber Tag, Feld*

Meph: Warum machst du Gemeinschaft mit uns
[wenn du nicht mit uns] auswirthschafften kannst . . .
Drangen wir uns dir auf oder du [dich] uns?

When a word has been misspelt in error, the same device is used, e.g., ll. 339 and 404, Me[p]h; Auerbachs Keller, l. 87, Nach[t]s; l. 505, Wel[s]ch; l. 806, Sterbe[be]tte; l. 1110, nich[t]; l. 1186, sch[n]ürt. In two instances a syllable has been added to give the line the correct scansion:

- l. 646. Am höchsten Feyertag[e] gehn.
l. 681. Wird uns mit Himmels Mann' erfreu[e]n

How much more faithful the *Akademie* text is than any that has been available hitherto becomes clear from a comparison with other editions. All of these admit deviations from the original in varying degrees. The first editor, Erich Schmidt, claims, though with a few reservations mentioned below in this article, that he is reproducing the original 'in einem buchstabentreuen Abdruck, der die Eigenthümlichkeiten der Interpunction und Orthographie wie ein Facsimile wiedergibt'.² However, he makes the following changes without admitting that he is doing so:

- 1 A comma is added l. 7 after *gar*; l. 39 after *Bergeshöhn*; l. 54 after *vollgepropft*; l. 965 after *Stücken*.
- 2 The comma is omitted l. 1418 after *Sinnen*.
- 3 A comma replaces a full-stop l. 913, after *finde*.
- 4 An apostrophe is added l. 158 after *fühl*; l. 847 after *Find*.
- 5 The apostrophe is omitted l. 977, *dirs*; l. 1023, *ichs*; l. 1158, *mans*.
- 6 An exclamation mark is added l. 65, after *Auf*.
- 7 The full-stop is omitted l. 786 after *leer*; l. 995 after *gehn*; l. 1008 after *scherzen*.
- 8 A semi-colon replaces an exclamation mark, A.K. l. 3, after *Baumwolle her*.

He admits changing l. 68 *genung* to *genug* because the rhyme *Buch/genung* seems impossible and Goethe uses both forms, but passes over without comment two other alterations for the sake of rhyme: l. 542 *lebst* (in place of *lebest*) to rhyme with *durchwebst* and l. 679 *weihn* (in place of *weißen*) to rhyme with *erfreun*. Other deviations, some 24 in all, come legitimately enough under the heading of the 'Fehler der Thüringerin' or the 'paar graphische Kleinigkeiten' which Erich Schmidt admits to having corrected 'stillschweigend'.³ However, there are others for which no argument seems valid. Though Schmidt states that he has retained Goethe's divided spelling of compound words,⁴ he has failed to do so in the stage directions to *Gartenhäusgen*, where he has *Herzklopfen* for *Herz klopfen*; further, l. 1392 *Stichelreden* for *Stichel reden* and l. 1430 *zusammenstürzen* for *zusammen stürzen*. In l. 516 he arbitrarily used *sein* for *seyn* and in l. 1251 *Gekoss* for *Gekos*. Possibly these are no more than the human mistakes that beset the path of any editor and proof-reader, but more puzzling is the stage direction following l. 631, where the manuscript reads: 'Sie eröffnet den Schrein ihre Kleider einzuräumen', and Schmidt replaces *Kleider* by *Sachen*. In this he is followed by later editors who claim that they are reprinting his 'Rohdruck' (e.g., L. A. Willoughby)⁵ though Witkowski,⁶ who states that he is reproducing 'Urfaust' 'wortgetreu' and follows Schmidt closely in other respects, here has correctly *Kleider*.

The *Weltausgabe*⁷ of Goethe's works, published in 1932 to mark the centenary of Goethe's death, also gives a text of 'Urfaust' in Vol. 12. Here the editor Max Hecker, then Director of the Goethe and Schiller Archives, Weimar, followed a completely new principle. Though he agrees that Frä. von Göchhausen made an earnest endeavour to reproduce Goethe's spelling and punctuation with the utmost exactness (e.g. by erasing the 'h' of the last syllable she changed *Menschheit* to *Menscheit* in the scene *Kerker*, l. 2), he claims that she was inconsistent in the care she took in copying—that she replaces Goethe's 'ss' as a rule by 'sz' (*dasz* instead of *dass*), and his 'ck' after a consonant by 'k' (*dünkt* instead of *dünckt*). He also accuses her of adapting some words to her Thuringian dialect and of omitting a word, a line, and on one occasion even two lines.⁸ The editor of the *Weltausgabe* not only corrects these and similar 'faults', but, as Goethe's own manuscript of 'Urfaust' has been lost or destroyed, he takes the bold step of making an 'earnest attempt to reproduce' his spelling by reference to other works written at the same time, in particular to the *Geschichte Gottfriedens von Berlichingen* (*binn. tuhn* etc.). Above all, he has endeavoured to bring uniformity into 'Urfaust' in place

of the variety in Frl. von Göchhausen's manuscript (*jetzt* and *jezt* and *iezt*; *laufen* and *lauffen*; *Christ* and *kristlich* etc.). As to punctuation, which he considers inadequate and faulty in the manuscript, he has changed it so that it 'brings out the sense clearly'. This is perhaps his most drastic change of all; it involves, among other things, replacing certain of Frl. von Göchhausen's exclamation marks by question marks and adding literally hundreds of commas where she has none (e.g. l. 102. 'Wo fass ich dich unendliche Natur!' becomes 'Wo fass ich dich, unendliche Natur?'). Further, he decides to omit almost completely the apostrophe, which Frl. von Göchhausen 'uses only sparingly' anyhow, and which, he states, Goethe used in a way that did not conform with any strict rule. There is no doubt that by such far-reaching changes a great deal of the breathless spontaneity of Goethe's lines has gone. Compare, for instance lines 1123-1133 in the original and in the *Weltausgabe*. The whole atmosphere of such crucial lines is changed by the orderliness of the punctuation of the latter in contrast with the lack of convention of the former:

Göchhausen

Weltausgabe

Mishör mich nicht du holdes
 Angesicht.
 Wer darf ihn nennen?
 Und wer bekennen?
 Ich glaub ihn!
 Wer empfinden?
 Und sich unterwinden
 Zu sagen ich glaub ihn nicht!
 Der Allumfasser
 Der Allerhalter
 Fasst und erhält er nicht
 Dich, mich, sich selbst!

Mishör mich nicht, du holdes
 Angesicht!
 Wer darf ihn nennen
 Und wer bekennen:
 Ich glaub ihn!
 Wer empfinden
 Und sich unterwinden
 Zu sagen: ich glaub ihn nicht!
 Der Allumfasser,
 Der Allerhalter
 Fasst und erhält er nicht
 Dich, mich, sich selbst?

Ironically enough, the only scene from this time that exists in the handwriting of both Frl. von Göchhausen and Goethe (*Land Strase*, ll. 453-6), is printed in the *Weltausgabe* in a form almost identical with Frl. von Göchhausen's, using her spelling, not Goethe's, of the three words where the two manuscripts differ (*Vorurtheil*, *genung*, *zuwieder*), and adding only punctuation marks that are in neither manuscript—which only seems to prove how impossible was the task the *Weltausgabe* set itself by trying to reconstitute rules for Goethe's spelling and punctuation at a time when he followed no set rules and in a work which could not possibly have been written all at once, within the space of a few weeks, as *Götz* was.

Perhaps Goethe's own words, in a letter written to Salzmann from Sesenheim in mid-June, 1771, would have been a better guide :

'Ich komme, oder nicht, oder—das alles werd ich besser wissen wenn's vorbey ist als jetzt. Es regnet draussen und drinne, und die garstigen Winde von Abend rascheln in den Rebblättern vorm Fenster, und meine *animula vagula* ist wie's Wetter-Hähngen drüben auf dem Kirchthurm; dreh dich, dreh dich, das geht den ganzen Tag, obschon das bück dich! streck dich! eine Zeit her aus der Mode kommen ist. *Punctum*. Meines Wissens ist das das erste auf dieser Seite. Es ist schwer gute Perioden, und Punkte zu seiner Zeit zu machen, die Mädgen machen weder Komma noch *Punctum*, und es ist kein Wunder wenn ich Mädgen-Natur annehme.'

Indeed, a closer scrutiny of Goethe's works might well confirm the evidence of his correspondence—that language and style are in tune with each changing circumstance and are an integral part of what he has to say (cf. the style of a formal letter to Hermann dated 15th May, 1773 with the informality of several letters to Kestner of the same period.) Perhaps the most perfect example in *Faust* of the harmony of sound and sense is the *Helena* act of *Faust* Part II, the work of Goethe's mature years, but that same talent for combining the two was given its youthful expression in the less serene melody of 'Urfaust', to separate them is to do less than justice to Goethe's art.

An important post-war edition that has followed the *Weltausgabe* text is the one edited by Professor Ernst Beutler⁹ in 1949 in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Goethe's birth. Beutler pays tribute to Max Hecker, editor of the *Welt-Goethe-Ausgabe*, for his work as keeper of the Goethe-Schiller archives at Weimar from 1900 until his death in 1948—work so constant, so critical and so sensitive that Beutler can say: 'Er war, wie keiner, berufen, die oft ausserordentlich flüchtigen, gleichsam nur hingehauchten und halb schon wieder verwischten Bleistiftstücke schwieriger Faustblätter zu entziffern.'¹⁰ These remarks are addressed particularly to Max Hecker's work on the *Paralipomena*, but by accepting his text for 'Urfaust', Beutler tacitly accepts his authority here, too.

Another valuable edition of Goethe's works that was published to mark the 200th anniversary of his birth is the *Hamburger Ausgabe*.¹¹ The editor, Professor E. Trunz, turns his back on all the problems that arise from unconventional or alternative spelling and punctuation and states simply that his edition modernises both. This is a great gain for a reader today who wishes to inform himself on the content and arrangement of the scenes of 'Urfaust', as he

is not impeded by words and forms that seem unfamiliar at first glance. The student, however, is deprived of that pervading quality or atmosphere that is as much an expression of Goethe's 'Sturm und Drang' years as is any other aspect of his '*Urfaust*'. An edition now in course of publication¹² aims at steering a middle course between the one extreme of retaining the original text, with all the difficulties it provides for inexperienced students, and the other, of removing some of those difficulties by a thorough-going modernisation. In his preface, Professor R. H. Samuel writes: '... in order to retain as much as possible of the "timbre", the flavour and the mood of Goethe's Storm and Stress period, those peculiarities which pertain to sound values have been retained. They imply directions for production on the stage which would be lost were they modernised too... Further, the present edition retains Goethe's usage of writing a compound in two words if the second word begins with a capital letter (*Gedanken Fabrik*) and those adjectives which show capital letters if this device indicated special stress... In order to retain the rhythm wherever possible the punctuation of the Ms has been retained wherever question or exclamation marks or full stops are found.'

All these editions that have appeared during the past seventy years have played their part in bringing Goethe's '*Urfaust*' before a wider public, but many problems have still to be solved; e.g.,

- 1 Is the Göchhausen manuscript the full text of *Faust* in 1775, i.e., of '*Urfaust*'? Does it correspond with what Goethe read between 27th November and 3rd December 1775 to the Weimar Court?¹³
- 2 Did Frl. von Göchhausen use a manuscript by Goethe?
- 3 If so, was it Goethe's original manuscript or a copy?
- 4 Is *Land Strase* in Goethe's handwriting part of the old manuscript or of a different one from which Frl. von Göchhausen copied?

In attempting to answer such questions, the scholar will need the authenticity of the original documents. By making them available in such convincing form, the Deutsche Akademie has done great service to scholarship.

NOTES

¹ cf. Ernst Grumach: *Zum Urfaust*, in *Goethe*. Neue Folge des Jahrbuchs der Goethe-Gesellschaft, Weimar, 16. Band, 1954, p.141. 'Ich habe daher in

Goethe's 'Urfaust'

dem soeben erschienenen Urfaust-Band der Akademie-Ausgabe die Formen blagen, Malda, murmelt usw. geschont . . .'

² Goethe's *Faust* in ursprünglicher Gestalt, nach der Göchhausenschen Abschrift herausgegeben. Erich Schmidt, 2. Abdruck, Böhlau, Weimar, 1888. Einleitung, XXXVI-XXXVII.

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Goethe's *Urfaust* and *Faust*, *Ein Fragment*, L. A. Willoughby, Blackwell, Oxford, 1943.

⁶ Goethe's *Faust*, 1. Band. G. Witkowski, Brill, Leiden, 1949; 2. Teil, p.58.

⁷ Goethe's Werke. Im Auftrage des Goethe-und Schiller Archivs herausgegeben von Anton Kippenberg, Julius Petersen und Hans Wahl. 1932; 12. Band. Nachwort des Herausgebers Max Hecker, p.406 ff.

⁸ *ibid.* pp.406 ff.

⁹ Goethe. Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche. Artemis Verlag, Zürich, 1949. ed. E. Beutler. Band 5. Die Faustdichtungen.

¹⁰ *ibid.* p.540.

¹¹ Goethes Werke, Hamburger Ausgabe. Christian Wegner Verlag, Hamburg, 1949. ed. E. Trunz. Band 3.

¹² *Urfaust*. Goethe's Faust in its original version (1775), Macmillan, London. 1957. ed. R. H. Samuel.

¹³ 'Einen Nachmittag las Göthe seinen halbfertigen Faust vor. Es ist ein herrliches Stück. Die Herzoginnen waren gewaltig gerührt bei einigen Szenen'.

Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg an Henriette von Bernsdorff, 6. Dec., 1775.

LA DESCENDANCE AUSTRALIENNE DU POÈTE PIBRAC

MARCEL CHICOTEAU

Sydney

Parmi les rapports d'ordre littéraire —peu nombreux d'ailleurs— entre la France et l'Australie, la traduction en vers anglais des *Quatrains Moraux* du Seigneur de Pibrac, œuvre de feu M. Eccleston du Faur, mérite une place d'honneur, ne serait-ce qu'en raison de la parenté du traducteur et du rimeur français du seizième siècle.

Il y a tout lieu de croire, en effet, que le citoyen australien Eccleston du Faur, homme de lettres, médecin, botaniste fort estimé en son pays, traducteur d'Horace, 'dilettante' comme il s'intitulait le plus volontiers, décédé à Turramurra, Nouvelle Galles du Sud le 24 août 1915, fut l'un des descendants directs de Gui du Faur de Pibrac, poète très doué, moraliste, ambassadeur de Charles IX, protégé de Catherine de Médicis, et ultérieurement Président du Parlement sous Henri III.

Sidere mens eadem mutato. Des indications fournies par M. Guy du Faur, seul fils survivant du traducteur, et résidant à Pibrac House, Turramurra, il ressort que les descendants du poète français auraient émigré en Angleterre à la suite de la Révolution pour s'y faire naturaliser britanniques peu après. Cette famille passa en Australie dans le courant du dix-neuvième siècle.

Il peut être intéressant pour les amateurs de Pibrac de savoir que M. Guy du Faur possède les documents généalogiques attestant le bien fondé de ses déclarations, de même que des éditions sans doute rares des œuvres du rimeur, entre autres un exemplaire de *La Bergère* faisant partie de la ré-édition de 1875 basée sur les textes de l'Abbé de la Roche (1746), et d'A-M. Boulard (1802).

La traduction anglaise des *Quatrains Moraux* de M. Eccleston du Faur ne paraît jamais avoir été imprimée. Ce dernier croyait, lorsqu'il l'entreprit, que l'œuvre de Pibrac n'avait pas auparavant fait l'objet d'une traduction en langue anglaise. Il reconnut par la suite qu'il s'était trompé sur ce point, et annexa à son texte la traduction de Joshua Sylvester exécutée à Londres en 1605. Prenant pour document de base l'édition de Florent Chrestien (Paris, 1621), E. du Faur reproduisit le texte français en y juxtaposant sa propre traduction. Le tout constitue un livre dactylographié, relié par lui-même avec titre gravé en lettres dorées, et portant la date de 1907. Je dois à son fils l'autorisation de conserver cet exemplaire.

vraisemblablement unique, et que j'avais eu la chance de trouver à Sydney.

Pibrac paraît avoir été bien compris de son descendant australien. La traduction est précise et soignée, la versification de l'original est respectée scrupuleusement, la langue anglaise se prêtant aux pentamètres iambiques utilisés par Pibrac. La langue d'Eccleston du Faur est riche, harmonieuse, et reflète la concision de pensée et l'agencement des idées qui font le charme des *Quatrains*.

D'autre part, il n'est pas sans intérêt de constater que les sentiments religieux de Pibrac qui, jusqu'au milieu du dix-neuvième siècle, ont exercé une influence si bienfaisante sur les enfants de France, ont fortement agi sur la personnalité de son descendant savant et philanthrope. Ainsi que ce dernier le démontre dans l'introduction dont il a fait précéder son texte, Pibrac a eu le mérite d'avoir eu, avant toute chose, le courage de ses convictions; c'est ainsi qu'il n'avait pas craint, même alors qu'il représentait le Roi de France au Concile de Trente, de s'attaquer à un despotisme royal dont il redoutait les excès et dont il prévoyait déjà l'effet funeste. De même, Eccleston du Faur s'est fait l'apôtre d'un 'anglicanisme modéré' (il aurait appartenu à la Haute Eglise anglaise, dite anglo-catholique), et il aurait été non moins militant sur ce chapitre que son ancêtre, défenseur des droits de l'église gallicane.

Il n'en reste pas moins vrai que les *Quatrains Moraux* constituent une sorte de catéchisme en vers, dépourvu de tout dogme ecclésiastique. A ce titre, et bien qu'ils fissent l'objet des lectures spirituelles des jeunes filles de St Cyr sous l'œil vigilant de Madame de Maintenon, ils ressemblent plutôt à une œuvre de protestant modéré; c'est peut-être ce qui explique la facilité avec laquelle ils ont prêté à une traduction anglaise.

Le texte de M. Eccleston du Faur se trouve agrémenté par une reproduction photographique du Château de Pibrac (Haute Garonne), monument du seizième siècle renouvelé par le vicomte du Faur en 1888. Il ne semble pas que ce château appartienne aujourd'hui à M. du Faur fils qui, âgé de 80 ans, a toujours habité l'Australie.

Par contre, les associations de la région de Turrumurra révèlent tout l'intérêt que portait à son patrimoine le poète australien. Dans la 'Kuringai-Chase', vaste parc national dont ce dernier dota l'état de Nouvelle Galles du Sud, et où se trouvent au moins deux plaques commémoratives du descendant de Pibrac, il existe une Avenue Pibrac et deux propriétés privées portant cet illustre nom.

Il reste indubitable qu'Eccleston du Faur possédait parfaitement la langue de Pibrac et qu'il a voulu faire honneur à son ascendant.

C'est sans doute ce qui explique pourquoi le Consul Général de France à Sydney se fit un devoir, en 1915, alors que se forgeait une nouvelle camaraderie d'armes franco-australienne, de représenter la République aux obsèques de celui qui devait laisser en Australie un témoignage poétique à son ancêtre le 'vieux rimeur de Toulouse'.

BOOK REVIEWS

ON THE POETRY OF KEATS. E. C. Pettet. *Cambridge University Press*, 1957, pp.viii + 395, 35/-.

This book consists of a series of interconnected critical essays covering most of Keats's important poems. It is 'modern' in its method of working from a detailed analysis of the actual text of the poems, but, unlike some other recent studies, it has no metaphysical or symbolical barrow to push. Indeed, though Mr Pettet offers only a very few 'general conclusions', these constitute a denial of the Shakespearian profundities and systematic visions which critics like Murry and Wasserman have discovered in Keats's major work. The bulk of his poetry, says Mr Pettet, is 'predominantly an expression of two activities'—of 'luxury' and 'fancy', that is, a richly cultivated sensuous experience, and 'warm imaginings of an ideal life', acknowledged by Keats to be based on wishful feeling and thinking. Only in the second *Hyperion* (not examined in detail here) does Keats show signs of emerging from this realm of 'poesy' into a full and mature 'poetry'. The test case is *Endymion*, to which Mr Pettet devotes two very long essays: as he reads the poem, there is in it 'nothing that would lead us to suppose that Keats was writing an allegory full of metaphysical or neo-platonic significance . . . he intended *Endymion* simply as a tale of 'pure deliciousness' more like *Venus and Adonis* than . . . a book of *The Faerie Queene*'.

Being heartily sick of warmed-over metaphysics in literary criticism, I am ready and willing to be convinced; and I find Mr Pettet's long analysis of the *Ode to a Nightingale* especially sensible and stimulating. Read in this way, the great odes are not reduced in stature. Their contradictions, their mysterious inconsistencies become rather the very human signs of a man pulled two ways, holding in precarious balance things as they are and as one dreams they might be. Keats was too honest to fake a solution, to construct a tidy systematic poetry conceived in contradiction of what he knew human experience to be. The analysis of the *Grecian Urn* given here is perhaps less satisfactory in some respects; but it is only at school that we can be confident that we know what that very difficult poem 'means'.

Mr Pettet's admirable book is complementary to the work of Mr Gittings in *John Keats: The Living Year*. Both, in their different ways, show that Keats was always growing: that his poetry was written intimately out of immediate experience and immediate reading, and so carries the warm imprint of his own impatient humanity.

Book Reviews

THE LIFE OF ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. Gardner B. Taplin. London, John Murray, 1957, pp. xv + 482.

This book is really two books, one first-rate, the other mediocre. The preface makes it clear that it was originally intended to be a discussion of Mrs Browning's poetry and the development of her reputation. In the course of his work the author found so much new material in unpublished letters that the balance of the book swung to biography. It is fortunate that this was so. The quality of critical insight shown is not of a high order. There is little critical discussion of any importance on the poems. Indeed much of the space devoted to the poetry is given over to summarising—ten whole pages go to a prose paraphrase of *Aurora Leigh*.

On the biographical side, however, the book is an excellent example of the good qualities of typically American methods of research. The English trained researcher knows where to find his material. He tends to log it up in notebooks, loose sheets, and on any writing material that comes to hand. When he tries to organise his mass of data into a book he is often overwhelmed and produces a poor book. But where he has the quality of mind that can organise his material (mentally rather than physically) the result is as good as they come—*The Allegory of Love* is a good example. American research schools train in physical organisation. Even the second-rater knows how to get his information on to 5 by 3 cards at the rate of one card one fact. When he comes to survey his material, the organisation is imposed by the cards. They can be shuffled and reshuffled according to a scheme depending on logic or chronology. The weakness lies in the danger that general ideas may slip through the interstices. Both methods have their virtues—the American who can both organise his cards and hold firmly to the central ideas of his thesis can challenge the world of scholarship—witness Harbage's *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*.

The card-system is peculiarly well fitted for biographical research and the author has done a beautiful job of organisation in this book. In biography the facts matter. They are the biography. In criticism the facts are only the data for speculation. Elizabeth Barrett Browning comes alive in this book as in none I have read. She is not merely a female poet or one half of the Browning love-letters. We have the full sweep from childhood to womanhood, with Robert Browning properly and firmly kept in his place as the second actor in *her* drama. The use of many unpublished letters has filled in the details and added colour to the bare outlines, which was all that was earlier available. In spite of what I have said about the nature of the critical comments, this is an important book on Mrs Browning.

Victoria University of Wellington

IAN A. GORDON

Blake's MARRIAGE OF HEAVEN AND HELL, A CRITICAL STUDY. Martin K. Nurmi. Kent State University Bulletin, Volume XLV, Number 4, Research Series III, 1957, Kent, Ohio, pp. 1-63.

Professor Nurmi makes the claim that in the study of Blake, the general aspect of his thought and his art have now been well enough treated by scholarship, and that the present work is a first step in what he regards as the second stage of the process, the study of individual works in detail.

The study is a valuable one and breaks new ground. Blake's *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* is the most important of his early works, and perhaps the most important of all of them for an understanding of the earlier stages of his philosophy and its bases. Professor Nurmi has made clear

Book Reviews

the nature of the general ideas and theories embodied in the work. In particular he has for the first time, I believe, shown the light the work throws on Blake's theory of multiple vision, and he is the first to sort out the tangle of references to the doctrine of the contraries, so important to an understanding of this work and of the *Songs of Innocence and Experience*. What previous commentators have not been clear about is the dramatic form of the work, and the sense in which the views expressed by the various persons introduced, should be related to the views of Blake himself. As a work of exposition and explanation it is a valuable study.

As a work of criticism it is less satisfactory. Sloss and Wallis, in their monumental work *The Prophetic Writings of William Blake*, have praised it justly but as justly noted that 'unity of final effect is precisely what the book fails to achieve'. This is a sober critical view. Professor Nurmi somewhat unsobberly tries to prove that the marriage is what he calls 'a shapely masterpiece.' He does this by suggesting that the construction resembles that of a rondo in music, with an interweaving of subjects and countersubjects on a musical rather than any conventional literary plan. It is ingenious but unconvincing. Blake is unlikely to have known the technical construction of a rondo, there is no evidence that he thought of constructing literary works on musical models, and Professor Nurmi makes no attempt to support his theory by evidence circumstantial or direct. On the other hand, we do know that Blake was defective in architectonic skills, and that his other longer works display the same effect of lack of unity, order and proportion which is a character of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.

Professor Nurmi says that his elucidation of the text of *The Marriage* 'is not intended as a substitute for the text', an incredibly naïve remark to find in a work of scholarship.

Canberra University College

A. D. HOPE

STUDIES ON CHAUCER AND HIS AUDIENCE. M. Giffin. *Quebec, Les Editions 'L'Eclair'*, 1956, pp.127, \$4.75.

Professor Giffin's book consists of studies of four Chaucerian poems—*The Second Nun's Tale*, *The Parlement of Foules*, *The Man of Law's Tale*, and *The Complaint to his Purse*. These four studies are loosely linked by Professor Giffin's attempt to use the circumstances of the production of the poems in question and the nature of their intended audience as instruments of elucidation and explication.

One cannot fail to be impressed by the care with which she has gone about her task, and certainly the direction in which her studies have taken her is one that can and does produce fruitful results. At all points we feel that we are dealing with a scholar whose erudition and acumen are notable, and who comes to Chaucerian problems with an enthusiasm and a persistence which sometimes bewilder us. This book is the product of unusual industry and considerable scholarship.

There is, then, a great deal here which we should applaud and for which we are grateful. It is the book of a scholar very much *au fait* with her subject. But this cannot stifle what I regard as necessary and serious criticisms. It is clear that—able as the author's handling of her material is—this book is very much the product of the research student patiently and painfully amassing evidence to bolster a series of theses. In each case there is a clearly-defined, often quite simple, thesis enunciated, and the body of the chapter is devoted to sustaining this by the collection and examination of evidence. This is, of course, a legitimate, even if rather dull, procedure, and there is no reason why a book should not be written upon these principles. But here, as we might properly fear, the result is that the

Book Reviews

argument is often wire-drawn and there is, too frequently, little enough in the mass of evidence collected to justify the initial proposition.

In this category, I should certainly place the chapter devoted to *The Second Nun's Tale*. Professor Giffin's attempt to link the tale with the creation of Adam Easton as Cardinal Priest of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere is ingenious and, in a sense, plausible. But I, for one, cannot find her collection of evidence and discussion of it at all conclusive or convincing. Indeed, I should have thought the facts patient of a much more obvious solution. Many of her conclusions seem to me frankly gratuitous, and I remain unshaken by most of her assumptions and inferences. She may be right: she certainly has not converted me to her views. The chapter dealing with *The Parlement of Foules* is an interesting one, and it provides some genuine illumination for readers of the poem and, since the sustaining of a thesis is less obtrusive here, the chapter seems to me to gain substantially. I should judge this to be the most useful chapter in the book, though, again, one would certainly not necessarily endorse all its conclusions. Of the remaining chapters, I find that devoted to the *Man of Law's Tale* unconvincing, especially in its later pages where Professor Giffin seeks to link it with Constanza of Castile, wife of John of Gaunt. I do not find the line of argument persuasive and, what is more important, I am very doubtful whether Chaucer really wrote in the way suggested.

But perhaps my most serious criticism of this book is that, as it stands, it seems to me quite unsatisfactory in its form. At the end it remains four studies loosely linked by the prefatory and concluding discussion, and it never seems in danger of becoming a unified study. Admittedly we are warned by the title to expect just this, but since this is so, I doubt whether it was wise to publish it. The four studies seem to me admirable contributions to a learned journal where they would have found their appropriate context. If they are to be worked up into book form, I feel that we have the right to demand that the material which they contain should have been carefully worked over and that some serious attempt should have been made to fuse them into a connected study. After all, the author is not yet a distinguished scholar who has earned the right to expect a demand for his *obiter dicta* and occasional studies. It seems to me premature and a trifle misguided to assume that four such specialised and speculative articles deserved publication in what would appear to be a rather expensive volume.

University of Queensland

G. H. RUSSELL

BEOWULF. A Prose Translation with an Introduction by David Wright. Penguin Books, pp.122, 2/6.

This is a prose translation in contemporary English, successfully picking a course between Wardour St English and colloquialism. Something must always be lost in a prose version of a poem, as Mr Wright knows: 'Where the leaves are off a great oak it is still possible to admire the nobility and spread of its branches. It is not necessary to trick them out with imitation foliage.' The imagery, alliteration and rhythm of the original poem are therefore not here, and the prose rearrangement of the sentence leads to minor differences in emphasis. What is brought out, however, is the general structure of the poem, the story, and this has often been underrated. Only after an initial period of philological work could the poem begin to be appreciated, and then the beauty of individual passages was more striking than the coherence of the whole. The work of Tolkien and Bonjour is implicit behind this presentation of *Beowulf* chiefly for its story.

The translator says that he does not intend to produce a crib, a purpose answered already by Clark-Hall's more literal prose translation. The availability of a Penguin edition will undoubtedly commend it for that

Book Reviews

purpose, however. Students will any way gain a great deal from the introduction and notes and the appendices on the author, manuscript and bibliography of *Beowulf* and the Sutton Hoo discoveries. There are genealogical tables and a glossary of proper names.

University of Canterbury

G. W. TURNER

THE ELIZABETHANS. Allardyce Nicoll. *Cambridge University Press*, 1957, pp. viii + 174. 25/-.

This attractively produced volume, a combination of anthology and picture-book, is intended to mirror the daily life of the Elizabethans by allowing them to speak as directly as possible for themselves. The numerous extracts in prose and verse are drawn from every kind of source, from Shakespeare to the humblest tract-writer, from the speeches of the Queen to contemporary recipe-books. The interspersed illustrations are equally varied; there are title-pages, decorations and cuts from books, details from paintings, photographs of houses and furniture, eating utensils, musical and scientific instruments, ships, plans, maps, weapons—but above all, portraits. If one wishes to find out what the Elizabethans thought about the spheres of heaven and earth, or the right diet for a phlegmatic man, or what a brothel looked like, or a rat-catcher, or Paul's Cross, or Sir Martin Frobisher, or Bess of Hardwick, or old London Bridge, one can do so from this book. The profusion and breadth of reference ensure that something will catch the interest of everyone likely to open these pages, whether specialist student or general reader.

This is not merely a scrap-book, however, for the attempt has been made to give it order and coherence by two means, firstly, by grouping the material into sections centring round important themes and secondly, by making each extract lead into the next so as to provide a logical development within each section. First comes the Queen (a whole section to herself), next the hierarchical order of the heavens and earth, followed by the various degrees among the Queen's subjects, then London and the countryside and so on, concluding with the arts, the army and the navy. To give unity to individual sections, to make each one read easily and flow together into a consistent whole, Professor Nicoll quite often uses very short linking quotations, even single sentences, between the longer ones. With the same object he has adapted his originals where necessary—quite freely, it seems. 'While due care has been exercised to ensure faithfulness to these originals I have permitted myself . . . to omit phrases, and even sentences, without the use of the dots commonly employed to mark elisions, to leave out speakers' names in extracts from plays, substituting generic titles for specifically named characters . . .'

Neither expedient is really successful. Very short snippets draw attention to lack of continuity instead of masking it, the sequences of sustained passages make the most readable sections. And the adaptation seems unfortunate, particularly as there are no indications, for it deprives the book of usefulness for scholarly purposes. Not that this would have mattered if Professor Nicoll had frankly addressed himself to the common reader. The trouble is that he doesn't seem to have had any particular type of reader clearly in mind. For instance, alongside these liberties with the text his means of identifying extracts must seem extremely pedantic. In the Notes he refers always to original editions rather than later more accessible ones. How useful is it likely to be to the general reader to begin a note on Drayton's well-known panegyric of Marlowe's 'brave translunary things' as follows: 'Michael Drayton, *Poems* (1619), pp.206-7, sigs. Dd 1 verso—Dd 2 recto?' Wouldn't it have been better to give the name of the poem and a modern anthology where it can be found?

Book Reviews

Similarly, why assume that the reader will know who wrote 'Colin Clout's Come Home Again' (p.38) and then inform him in Note 280 that Spenser wrote *The Faerie Queene*? And why gloss only a very few of the unusual words? The book would have gained greatly by more attention to such details.

The pictorial material, specially the portraits, which in their variety and excellence give the book perhaps its strongest appeal, does in general fulfil Professor Nicoll's claim that it tells its own story. With the idea of avoiding distraction, he has omitted captions. But here again the reader's interests could have been considered more. What is the object being balanced against the Scriptures in the emblem of the first illustration? Picture No. 8 surely needs more explanation than the note provides. And what is the queer hook-like thing resembling a guard of some sort, attached to the left shoulder and encircling the sword-blade of the soldier in No. 389?

Professor Nicoll's initial contention, a running theme in several of the short introductions which he provides for the various sections, is that 'extensive inconsistency . . . may be taken as a prime symbol of the Elizabethan age'. This idea was stated very emphatically by Lytton Strachey in *Essex and Elizabeth* and is often repeated, but is no truer for that. Certainly the Elizabethan period was one of strong contrasts, but it seems most unlikely that it was less consistent than any other age. The examples given by Professor Nicoll are either not real inconsistencies at all or else they could be easily paralleled in other times.

In providing a background for the period, *The Elizabethans* is no substitute for more solid and comprehensive works such as *Shakespeare's England*; nevertheless, besides being of general interest, it is likely to be very useful either as a supplement or a stimulant, particularly at upper sixth form level or in the earlier stages of university study.

University of Canterbury

A. W. STOCKWELL

LADY MEED AND THE ART OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN'. A. G. Mitchell.
(The 3rd Chambers Memorial Lecture, University College, London.)
Published for the College by H. K. Lewis. 27 pp. 3/6.

In essence this lecture is a plea for an appreciation of *Piers Plowman* as a successful allegory. It is not enough to enjoy the narrative leaving the allegory as far as possible aside, or to expound the allegory by means of some historical or doctrinal key and regard the action as interlude. A discussion of that part of the poem dealing with Lady Meed (Passus I-IV in the B-text) demonstrates an approach in which thought and action are taken to be fused, and every gesture and every overtone in the action and dialogue has significance for the allegory. Such a method precludes the comfortable assumption that the allegory is on the whole obscure and wandering, but it also avoids the obtrusive historical reference (here Lady Meed temporarily 'becomes' Alice Perrers). Interest is centred right in the poem itself and in the interplay of its details. A single coherent theme has to be found. Professor Mitchell convinces us that such a theme can be found in the story of Lady Meed, and I have found that his 'holistic' approach to this part of the poem commends itself to a Stage III class.

The historical key method is frequently applied to the reference in 'Piers Plowman' to the Normandy wars (A.iii. 182-204), in which Meed blames Conscience for his cowardly advice to the King to give up his French heritage for a little silver. Huppé, for example, identifies Conscience with John of Gaunt. Yet here, surely, we must agree with Professor Mitchell that the allegorical characters speak in character and that the historical allusion comes in naturally as an illustration of a general point: that Conscience, interfering with a plan already under way,

may cause defeat where pure hope of reward would have carried the campaign to success. Many a modern spokesman of Material Interests has talked similarly of Public Opinion in the Suez campaign, and if the situation was allegorized, the figures would not need to be identified with particular people. And a revision of the allegory some years hence would omit the Suez illustration as no longer topical, just as the C-text of *Piers Plowman* omits reference to the Norman wars.

Reason has the last word to say against Meed, and so Professor Mitchell is justified when he attaches importance to his closing remark, though it is one normally dismissed as obscure. It weaves into an allegorical sentence some words from Innocent's *De Contemptu Mundi*:

For *nullum malum* be mon mette [with] *inpunitum*

And bad *nullum bonum* be *irremuneratum*

[A.iv. 126-7]

Professor Mitchell seems to take this to imply that Meed not only deprives a good man of reward (in defiance of Innocent's command) but 'causes him suffering without redress'. Likewise 'the wicked man is rewarded'. At first this is not quite convincing, especially as Meed does offer compensation to Peace when he has been molested by Wrong (B.iv. 98ff.) But the interpretation could be supported and is perhaps too summarily presented here (see note below).

The C-text (C.iii. 335-409) adds an even more difficult passage which has universally been dismissed as unintelligible. Even E. T. Donaldson (*Piers Plowman: The C-text and its Poet*) can only suggest hopefully that an interpretation might someday be found. Professor Mitchell faces this difficulty too, and makes the passage intelligible, though he does not quite explain the grammatical point on which it is based. The terms used, 'direct and indirect relations,' do not appear to be common ones in grammar or logic. The justification of passages such as this is important because much discussion about authorship has hinged on such 'imperfections' in the C-text.

It appears from Professor Mitchell's lecture that the author of *Piers Plowman* might have been a better and clearer thinker than is commonly supposed. But there remain some difficulties outside the part of the text treated here. For example, Piers directing pilgrims to Truth tells them among other things to *avoid* the croft called 'covet not men's cattle . . . etc.' This confusion of negative meanings is in contrast to the apparent mental agility that deals with the negatives in the *nullum malum* lines.

A Note on *nullum malum* . . . etc.

We are invited (B.iv. 145) to construe this vnglosed'. Does this mean that we must not, as Skeat does, simply refer the words to Innocent? Mediaeval logic deals frequently with sentences containing a negative such as *nullus*, pointing out that it can give a sentence various meanings depending on what *nullus* is taken to qualify. Walter Burleigh calls such sentences *multiplex* and says "quandocumque haec dictio 'non' ponitur in oratione cum multis determinabilibus, est oratio multiplex, ex eo quod haec negatio 'non' potest negare unum istorum determinabilium vel alterum." He applies this also to *nihil* and *nullus*. Such a thought seems to be behind Professor Mitchell's interpretation of these lines. Clearly Innocent meant that there should be no case of a bad man who goes unpunished; by inserting 'the mon', Langland wishes to separate *nullum malum* (making it the 'immediate constituent' in modern linguistic terminology). It becomes neuter instead of, as in Innocent's complete sentence, accusative, and means 'no evil', 'the man with no evil in him', 'the good man'. He should, of course, not be punished. Possibly Meed is taken to have recognised this when she offered compensation to Peace. But this principle logically implies (if we may so interpret *bad*, 'commanded') that a man who has done no good (*nullum bonum*) must not be rewarded—and so the whole basis of Meed's actions is undermined by reason.

An amusing example of similar thought processes is Burleigh's discus-

Book Reviews

sion of the sophisma *Nullo currente, tu es asinus*, which means either 'quolibet non currente, tu es asinus' or 'quolibet currente, tu non es asinus'. Similar examples are found in other logicians (e.g. Albert of Saxony, *Sophisma* 72), so that such distinctions were apparently common enough in mediaeval thought.

University of Canterbury

G. W. TURNER

THE TUNEFUL FLAME: SONGS OF ROBERT BURNS AS HE SANG THEM. Robert D. Thornton (ed.) *University of Kansas Press, Lawrence*, 1957. \$3.50.

This pleasant anthology of Burns songs contains twenty-five representative pieces, with music. Although published by a university press, it does not claim to be a work for the scholar: as the editor says, 'every precaution has been taken lest the volume be immured through erudition'.

When considering any of the songs Burns submitted to George Thomson's *Select Collection of Original Scottish* (sic) *Airs*, an editor has to be particularly careful; Thomson regularly tinkered with both words and music, sometimes setting the words to tunes other than those intended by Burns, sometimes even altering the accompaniments he ordered from distinguished foreign musicians. In the words of a German editor, Thomson 'not only incorrectly printed, but wilfully altered and abridged' Beethoven's accompaniments to Scottish songs. Beethoven was not so patient as Burns in the face of such audacity; he told Thomson that as his music was not written for schoolgirls, he wanted no changes made.

Wisely, perhaps, Mr Thornton has had nothing to do with the *Select Collection* at all—although some of the very best melodies, like the one attached to *Where are the joys I hae met in the morning*, were sent only to Thomson. Most of Mr Thornton's songs [apart from one or two where he has gone to later musical sources, like *The Melodies of Scotland* (1838)] are taken from James Johnson's *Scots Musical Museum*. Johnson simply printed what Burns sent to him, and used only the melodies the poet had chosen; consequently, the only errors likely to occur in the *Museum* are misprints or simple mistakes in transcription. An editor should be on guard against these, checking Johnson's music against previous printed or manuscript collections.

Unfortunately, we do not have a copy of the *Museum* to place against Mr Thornton's versions; but in the case of two songs taken not from the *Museum* but from J. C. Dick's *Songs of Robert Burns* (1903), Mr Thornton provides accompaniments for which there is no warrant in his source (pp.53, 63). It is a pity Mr Thornton does not state where these accompaniments came from; perhaps they are in his own. In his preface, he mentions assistance from Melville Smith, Director of the Longy School of Music at Cambridge, Massachusetts, but does not say exactly what this help was.

The accompaniments, indeed, are the worst thing in the book. They are not at all well-written, and they seem to have been provided specially for this edition, but in the absence of a copy of the *Museum* we cannot be absolutely certain of this. The harmony is not always inevitable, and what must surely be misprints occur—e.g. p.69, bar 4. Again, the sixth bar on p.64 is an example of ambiguous chordal progressions which seem irritating and out of place. In contrast, the interesting modal cadences in *Scots Wha Hae* (p.51) have an authentic flavour about them. But by and large the printing and lay-out of the music are not up to the standard of the rest of the book.

Melodically, the volume is most valuable because it gives us the tunes Burns had in his mind when he wrote the songs, not the ones foisted on them by Thomson and other editors. Some of these are different from the

Book Reviews

rhythms we all know, e.g. *The Banks o' Doon* and *Comin' Thro the Rye* (because of their rhythms and the 'Scotch snap'), or the *Auld Lang Syne* tune of 1796, which will sound strange to most people. Poetically, the anthology is a sheer delight; Mr Thornton has included no absolutely bad verses. We have two complaints, however: could the incomparable *Mary Morison* not have been substituted for the somewhat conventional *Afton Water*, and could such old favourites as *Scots Wha Hae* and *Green Grow the Rashes* not have been sacrificed in favour of, say, *Eppie McNab* and *Sweet Tibbie Dunbar*? It is good to see one example of what Burns used to call his 'cloaciniad' verse, that rollicking song *The Fornicator*; it should prove a great favourite with 'fraternities' and other male assemblies.

There is a scholarly and perceptive introductory essay by Mr Thornton which we hope is only the prelude to a more detailed critical study of the songs, his remarks on *John Anderson, my Jo* are especially acute. A generally competent marginal glossary is provided, although 'dumbell' for 'coof' seems unnecessarily slangy, and 'gals' for 'doxies' rather arch. We must protest at the transformation of a line that means 'And sorely with his love he did deafen me' into 'And sick in love he did deafen (pleaded with) me'; and although to translate a 'richt guid-willie waught' as 'a stiff one' is a happy inspiration, it still misses the ceremonial aspect of the original—the formal pledge of good-will.

However, these criticisms should not be allowed to obscure the real merits of the book. As a work of 'adult education' in the broadest sense, a collection of melodies and words which many singers will want to possess, it is most valuable. No University Library, no Public Library that prides itself on its music section, indeed no folksinger worth his salt, will want to be without it.

University of Canterbury
University of Auckland

JOHN RITCHIE
THOMAS CRAWFORD

ETUDES D'HISTOIRE DU THEATRE EN FRANCE AU MOYEN-AGE ET A LA RENAISSANCE. Gustave Cohen. *Paris, Gallimard, 1956, pp.452.*

There is an enriching experience in store for the reader of these collected articles of Gustave Cohen, published over the past fifty years, tracing the growth of the French theatre from its earliest forms arising out of the church ritual down to the Renaissance. Valuable footnotes have been added, giving the latest bibliographical information. One of the great merits of this collection is that it enables us to share anew in the exciting discovery of such treasures as MS 617 of the Musée Condé at Chantilly, which, as M. Cohen demonstrated, contained the earliest monuments of the Walloon theatre. Later we find ourselves at Mons, when the sagacious historian of the *mise en scène* unearthed the precious documents which he afterwards published as *Le Livre de conduite du Régisseur et le Compte des Dépenses pour le Mystère de la Passion joué à Mons en 1501*.

The first book deals with the Middle Ages, and among the great diversity of topics and themes examined, there is an absorbing chapter on *La 'Comédie' latine en France au XIIe siècle*, whose two volumes, admirably edited under the direction of G. Cohen with translation facing the Latin text, have long been a delight to medieval students. The second book, on the Renaissance, includes a substantial and penetrating study of *Rabelais et le Théâtre*, and shorter essays on Marot and Ronsard's relation to the stage. The modern revival of the medieval drama is the subject of the third and last book, introducing d'Annunzio with his *Martyre de saint Sébastien*, the rebirth of the Breton theatre, and the final chapter tells of the inspiring *Expériences théophiliennes*.

Nearly twenty-five years have now elapsed since Gustave Cohen prompted his students to restore to life the *Miracle de Théophile*. And what a magnificent revelation it turned out to be! Numerous medieval dramas have since been staged in various countries by those enthusiastic actors, who came to be styled *Théophiliciens*, after their first creation. M. Cohen's skilful *adaptations littéraires* remain as faithful to the original, in wording, rhythm, and often rhyme, as modern comprehension permits, and give the audience the illusion of hearing Old French. Thus he puts within immediate reach of everyone those treasures hitherto known to but a few scholars. Our gratitude goes to the inspired scholar who has done so much to dispel the Renaissance-begotten gloom of the Middle Ages, which he prefers to call *le premier âge*, and to reveal the splendid radiance of this heroic youth of our language and literature.

University of Melbourne

P. L. CANART

BALZAC ET RABELAIS. Maurice Lecuyer. Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', pp.222.

In its original form this book was a Yale doctoral thesis; rehandled for the purposes of publication, it is No. 47 in the series of French Studies sponsored by the Société des professeurs français en Amérique.

Straddled of course by Introduction and Conclusion, the body of the study is made up as follows:

Part I—Rabelais in France in Balzac's day.

Part II—(i) Rabelaisian tendencies in Balzac: physical and temperamental affinities between the two men. (ii) Documentation of the *Contes drolatiques*. (iii) Balzac's mental image of Rabelais.

Part III (and longest)—Presence of Rabelais in the work of Balzac.

The writer's stated aim is to trace the curve of what he calls 'la constante rabelaisienne' running through all of the work of Balzac, and to show 'comment le génie de ce dernier s'est reconnu dans son frère spirituel tourangeau'.

The author justly claims that his work represents the first thorough treatment of this fascinating subject. In fact his desire to leave nothing unsaid occasionally leads him to cite an example of dubious validity, as when (p.96) he suggests, admittedly in a tentative way, that the 'Peut-être' of Trousse in *L'Israélite* may have been inspired by the famous last words traditionally attributed to Rabelais. As for Balzac's satirical picture of the legal profession in his *Code des gens honnêtes*, referred to on page 167, the parallel with Panurge's observations seems hardly worth mentioning. After all, lawyers have always been one of the stock butts of the satirist, and moreover Balzac had first-hand knowledge of their ways. Then, does the scanty evidence he is able to adduce justify the author's assertion, 'Les preuves abondent . . . que sur la biographie du satirique il (Balzac) porte toujours un jugement très sûr' (p.98)? Finally, can it be held that Balzac's liking for Rabelais is apparent in each and every one of his works (p.101)? But these are trifling criticisms in respect of a generally excellent piece of work which meets the demands of the most rigorous scholarship.

The publication is very well produced, though a few typographical errors have crept in, and some of them have not been picked up in the *Corrigenda*: baillonné (p.54); les connaissances biographique—et bibliographique —d'Auguste-Alexis-Floréal Baron sur le curé de Meudon (p.63); Dès 1822 il avait consacré (A qui? A quoi?) un article où il mettait l'auteur du *Pantagruel* parmi les plus universels et les plus profonds des écrivains modernes (p.66); paroxisme (p.70); Gutemberg (p.72); Jean Sboger (p.83); si tu meures (p.96); Esther Gobsek (p.115); qui l'aurait voulu (for *qu'il*

Book Reviews

aurait voulu, p.124); *Béatrice* (for *Béatrix*, p.136); *Tristram Shandy* (p.142).

Without minimizing the other forces at work on Balzac, M. Lecuyer makes out a persuasive case for regarding him as 'l'équivalent de Rabelais dans la mesure où les œuvres de l'un et de l'autre recréent et résument leur époque' (p.210). And we whole-heartedly agree with him when he says that Rabelais and Balzac 'font partie tous deux de la grande famille des poètes. Seuls les vrais poètes possèdent ce don spécial qui leur révèle la réalité dans ces gigantesques proportions' (p.200). But, by the same token, few if any of us would subscribe to his view (p.194) that the *Contes drolatiques* are superior to *La Comédie humaine*. To conclude, M. Lecuyer has succeeded admirably in his undertaking, and he has done us the invaluable service of lighting up 'one of the facets of the Balzacian prism'.

Canberra University College

D. P. SCALES

BRITAIN IN MEDIEVAL FRENCH LITERATURE 1100-1500. P. Rickard. Cambridge University Press, 1956.

For some of us who were brought up on English history, it has been a curious experience to realize as we grew older how many picturesque historical incidents or anecdotes that linger in our memories were recorded by French writers: the account of Wat Tyler's rebellion, the romantic story of the White Ship, or the strategic use of quicklime at the naval engagement off Sandwich in 1217. The fact that they were recorded in French brings them into the purview of Dr Rickard's excellent and lucid study; but the author does not take time off to dwell on such long-lived and familiar trifles because he has so much to offer that is far less familiar and much more significant.

The scope of the subject borders on that of a study in comparative literature, but it is in fact much wider than the majority of such studies because it ranges over such a vast area of literature of infinite variety extending over four centuries. To cull from all this material the relevant detail, and to distil it into an elegant account in which scholarship is never subservient to mere learning, is a delicate task that Dr Rickard has accomplished with skill, grace and distinction.

To date Anglo-French cultural relations from the days of Alcuin and Bede may seem surprising at first, until we are informed that the writings of the latter were better known on the Continent both before and after the Conquest than those of Geoffrey of Monmouth. Considerable space is devoted to the complicated question of the 'Matter of Britain'. If the picture is not crystal clear even after two careful readings, that is due to its very complications, but at least one reader is grateful to Dr Rickard for the conciseness he has brought to the subject. Another fascinating topic is the way in which the poetic references in the *Chanson de Roland* to the conquest of England by Charlemagne (probably coloured by the Norman Conquest) were exploited by later poets.

From tenuous early contacts, through a period of comparative homogeneity of culture in Anglo-Norman times, the strains and stresses of the Hundred Years' War (in origin feudal rather than national, as we are reminded) and the consequent emergence of nationalism, Dr Rickard traces literary, political and cultural relations as reflected in French literature up to the end of the 14th Century. An interesting document of a kind that does not frequently grace comparative studies is the dignified and chivalrous *Débat des hérauts d'armes de France et d'Angleterre*, in spite of its slight bias and even if, as Dr Rickard admits, it is a little disappointing on the psychological side. The less complimentary French estimates of the character of the English, Scots and Irish have not been neglected (presumably the matter for an estimate of the Welsh is lacking).

Book Reviews

and it has all been accomplished without the aid of facile clichés like 'perfidious Albion'.

Printing and presentation are what we expect from the Cambridge University Press. Two trifling misprints are not worth specifying.

University of Auckland

A. C. KEYS

THREE CENTURIES OF FRENCH VERSE, 1511-1819. Alan J. Steele (ed.) *Edinburgh U.P.*, 1957, pp. xxxvii + 314.

This is a decade of anthologies. Among others, the *Oxford Book of French Verse* has just appeared (1957) in a second edition, covering nine centuries. Professor Boase's *Poetry of France* (1952) covered from André Chénier to Pierre Emmanuel, while Professor Hackett's *Anthology of Modern French Poetry* (1952) began at Baudelaire and also concluded with Pierre Emmanuel. The present anthology, from the Edinburgh University Press, and covering the three centuries 1511-1819, stretches all the way from Jean Lemaire de Belges to Marceline Desbordes-Valmore. And it is rather a stretch.

This book has not had a very good Press, and it is a pity. Admittedly its 'coverage' is too wide: to compress the work (however slenderly represented) of 117 poets over three centuries into 284 pages, in a period whose giants mostly belong to the first century involved, is a task that would tax the capacities of any editor. Mr Steele has drawn upon recent reassessments of poetic values, and his introduction is a stylish and pleasant piece of criticism which gives *droit de cité* to many lesser figures of poetry by doing scant justice to the greater (notably Du Bellay). And in the process of selection many familiar things are jettisoned—Ronsard's *Bel aubépin*, Malherbe's *Consolation à M. du Périer*, Voiture's *Sonnet à Uranie*, Scarron's *Épitaphe*, Molière's lines *A Monsieur Le Vayer*, La Fontaine's shorter *Fables*, all the Voltaire epigrams, Chénier's *Jeune Captive* and *Comme un dernier rayon*, and many others.

On the other hand, it is no crime to break new ground, and constant familiarity can impair appreciation. The student can probably come to no harm if he be led to spend somewhat more time on Théophile and Tristan L'Hermite and somewhat less on Boileau, if he finds D'Aubigné occupies space once ceded to Marot, or if he silence the rhetoricians a moment to hear the soberer tones of the late 17th century 'Quietist' poets. It is mainly in the 18th century that the wideness of choice makes for scrappiness—but there is always a touch of *pré-romantisme* to redeem classical diction from monotony. Altogether, it is an interesting new departure.

There is a very useful bibliography of the chief editions consulted.

R.T.S.

THE PENGUIN BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE: 3. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, introduced and edited by Anthony Hartley. *Penguin Books*, 1957, pp. xxxviii, 312.

Mr Hartley's anthology is one of the new Penguin Books of Verse series (collections of Spanish and German verse have already appeared) designed to make European poetry more accessible to the ordinary reader.

Nowadays an anthology is only satisfactory as a guide-post if it points a way. And Mr Hartley has selected poems to show that 'the history of 19th century poetry is that of two revolutions—one effected by the Romantics and the other by Baudelaire and his successors'. In his introduction he

Book Reviews

says that 'an anthology is bound to be personal and there is nothing that can be done about it'—thus disarming criticism, and invalidating any protest at the exclusion of at least a section from Alfred de Vigny's *La Maison du Berger* or Leconte de Lisle's *Quain*; and the inclusion of four pieces by Signoret at the expense of Banville—or further selections from others. But he states his preference for complete poems; and his sometimes excessively witty biographical notes betray his affections.

But this is an independent and, within its limitations, thoroughly representative selection. The Romantics are given sufficient space (one notes that Hugo's great later poems are gradually finding their rightful place); Nerval is honoured by ten pieces; and there are careful and generous selections from Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Verlaine and Rimbaud—and interesting pieces by Corbière, Verhaeren, Latourgue, Lautréamont and others. A prose translation appears discreetly with each poem; some renderings are only approximate; but most of them serve their purpose.

The introduction synthesizes the most recent discoveries and agreements. It explains the main differences between English and French poetry; the reasons for the divorce between the poet and society and its effect on the development of 19th century poetry; and it gives an acute critical assessment of some of the authors represented. It is a fine piece of critical writing: the work of an alert and vigorous mind.

University of Tasmania

V. B. SMITH

MASTERPIECES OF OLD FRENCH LITERATURE. Valkhoff, M. Johannesburg, Witwatersrand U.P., 1956, pp.ii + 162.

It is clear that this slim volume cannot be an exhaustive study of Mediaeval French literature. In the words of the author, his first aim was 'to write a readable book', and the audience he had in mind was 'the general reader with wide interests . . . , and second the student of French in an English or American University who may find here a first and easy guide'. It is in the light of such an intention that this book deserves to be judged.

The method Professor Valkhoff has employed is to examine in detail eight of the most outstanding works of the period, treating them principally as works of art in their own right, but also as representative of their particular 'genre'. To this end, he adds a kind of literary running commentary, intended to show the position of the chosen masterpiece in relation both to its own 'genre' and also to wider trends in Mediaeval literature. Obviously the task of choosing eight works to represent the best in five hundred years of literary production is extremely difficult, and must in the end be largely subjective. No one, however, is likely to dispute the worthiness of the majority of the works which figure in Professor Valkhoff's list. (*La Vie de St Alexis*, *La Chanson de Roland*, *Le Charroi de Nîmes*, Chrétien de Troyes' *Lancelot*, two branches of *Le Roman de Renart*, *Le Roman de la Rose*, Villon's *Testament* and *La Farce de Maître Pathelin*).

The chief weakness of the book would seem to lie in the author's arrangement of his material. The detailed analyses are, with one exception, relegated to the end of the chapters. If the chosen example represents the final peak of achievement in the 'genre', as, for example, Villon's *Testament* in the chapter on Lyric Poetry, this offers no inconvenience. At other times it involves the author in unnecessary repetitions and the reader in mental acrobatics. In the chapter on Romance (which might be more accurately entitled Narrative Literature), having followed the history of the 'genre' from its origins, by way of an excellent appraisal of Chrétien de Troyes to the XVth century *Quinze Joies de Mariage*, we are suddenly plunged back into the *Lancelot*—one could hardly imagine a greater contrast!

The author has tried, within his limited scope, to avoid presenting French

Book Reviews

Mediaeval literature as if it existed in a vacuum, by introducing references to English, German and, particularly interesting because of its inaccessibility to the average English-speaking reader, Dutch literature.

Though there are some minor details of fact and style that one might criticize (e.g. the author seems unable to decide who was the stepfather in the Roland-Ganelon relationship), nevertheless Professor Valkhoff has succeeded in his aim of writing 'a readable book', and one that should prove useful to many students as an elementary yet balanced introduction to Old French literature. A final word of praise must be added for the 'Bibliographical Guide' (the title is significant), the well-chosen illustrations, and the format of the book which makes it a pleasure to handle.

University of Canterbury

MARGARET A. COLING

COCTEAU, JEAN. *LA MACHINE INFERNALE* (ed. W. M. Landers). London, Harrap, 1957, pp.xxxix + 136.

Dr Landers' edition of Anouilh's *Antigone* was an excellent piece of work, and he brings to this other modern play in classical dress the same scholarly qualities of breadth, penetration and sympathy. The elusive, unpredictable Cocteau is not the easiest of authors to edit: posturing and panache, with the deliberate cult of unconscious inspiration, (drug-induced or otherwise), have tended to conceal the indubitable gifts of this man, who like Gide left no authentic *magnum opus* by which to be judged. Cocteau's life-long association with contemporary rebels, from Picasso to Honneger, his truculent individualism and contempt for accepted literary and moral values, and his unrelenting search for new techniques and new forms of expression, are sketched in by the editor in a persuasive introduction, which pleads attractively the merits of a novel and powerful play. The book makes a worthy addition to the publishers' series of contemporary works.

R.T.S.

HEINRICH VON KLEIST: *PRINZ FRIEDRICH VON HOMBURG* (ed. R. H. Samuel), London, Harrap (Harrap's German Classics), 1957.

Professor Samuel's edition of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is an outstanding work of scholarship, containing a comprehensive critical introduction and assembling for the first time relevant source material on the Battle of Fehrbellin in Appendices I-III. Unlike most of Kleist's plays, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* exists in only one form (cf. T. Kaiser, *Vergleich der verschiedenen Fassungen von Kleists Dramen*, Bern, 1944), and there is consequently no question of textual editing. The text itself is attractively and clearly set out with only two misprints (l. 599 zum zweiten Male; l.1013 knieend). Certain textual difficulties might however have been explained in the notes, as for instance the plural form 'die Handschuh' in the stage direction on p.87, which in the Kurz edition of Kleist's works is emended to die Handschuhe; or the bold, and at first sight baffling juxtaposition of neuter and feminine attributes in 11.355-356, likewise emended by Kurz, albeit incorrectly.

The Introduction gives a brief but lucid survey of the literary background to Kleist's work (pp.1-4). Nineteen pages are then devoted to an account of Kleist's life, the length of this section being justified by Professor Samuel's view that although the play 'had originally been conceived as another passionate appeal to patriotic impulses and national sentiments', it 'transformed itself into Kleist's life-story and into an attempt to resolve the problems with which his life was beset'. Due con-

Book Reviews

sideration to contemporary allusions in the play is nevertheless given in the Introduction and in the Notes. The third and longest section of the Introduction deals with the play itself (pp.24-68). The chapters on 'The Genesis and Fortunes of the Play' and on 'Sources and Events influencing the Play' are extremely informative, and bear witness to Professor Samuel's careful scholarship and extensive knowledge. Professor Samuel then proceeds to criticize the 'interpreters of the strictly Prussian observance' and 'those who stress the education theory' (p.43), but this leads him to an analysis of the Elector's character which may be disputed. He shows the Elector as behaving emotionally in his condemnation of Homburg after the battle, thus creating a 'dilemma' for himself, in that he would prefer not to carry out the punishment decreed, and would avoid this 'one possible consequence of his (the Elector's) rashness'. But the Elector does not, as Professor Samuel states (p.42), proclaim a sentence of death without conducting an investigation: 'er hat seinen Kopf verwirkt' must be taken to mean that the leader of the cavalry at Fehrbellin has by his flouting of battle orders made himself answerable to a charge which might entail the death penalty. Further, the statement (p.43) that the Elector only orders Homburg's imprisonment and court-martial 'after a long and dissembled diffidence' is neither accurate, nor does it seem to suit Professor Samuel's argument. The Elector's behaviour in the scene in question (II.751-790) is one of studied indifference to the consternation he has caused, but shows no trace of diffidence. Again Professor Samuel's suggestion concerning 1.722, that the Elector seeks reassurance 'that the Prince did not lead the cavalry', is difficult to reconcile with II.334-352, where the Elector specifically warns Homburg before the battle not to be rash and tempestuous: having given this warning only a few hours earlier, the Elector would rather expect that no one else but Homburg was the responsible cavalry-leader, even when he first says (II.715ff.)

Wer immer auch die Reiterei geführt . . .
Der ist des Todes schuldig.

Bearing this in mind, it is difficult to accept Professor Samuel's view that the Elector has rashly enmeshed himself in a dilemma from which he would like to escape even before the scene with Natalie (Act IV, Sc.1); or that the condition he attaches to Homburg's release (I.1185 f.) is an 'afterthought' after all one of the first questions the Elector puts to Natalie before he becomes 'verwirrt' (cf. Editor's comment p.44) is: 'Denkt Vetter Homburg auch so?' (I.1142).

The analysis of Homburg's character and development, on the other hand, seems unchallengeable, and the Introduction concludes with a penetrating discussion of the structure of the play, and comments on Kleist's use of language. The chapters on 'The Element of Comedy' might seem to treat the problem of Kleist's disturbing sense of the comic rather too lightly, and the illustration from the play on p.56 might have been used to develop a more detailed argument. Similarly, after having read Professor Samuel's review of Deiters' edition of Kleist (AUMLA, No. 5, Oct. 1956), one would have welcomed comment here too on the present attitude towards Kleist's work in Eastern Germany. Such details apart however, the Introduction must be acclaimed as a most thorough and stimulating study of Kleist as reflected in this play, so aptly characterised (p.54) as a perfect blending of problem drama and stagecraft.

The Notes provide further evidence of Professor Samuel's careful scholarship, although certain difficulties might have received comment: for instance, the invraisemblance of Natalie's intrigue (I.1265f. and I.1395f.), or the forms of address, on which there is only one isolated comment.

The Select Bibliography lists the most important editions of the play, and literature concerning Kleist and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. The list does not claim to be complete, but even so one is surprised to note that in the first section no mention is made of Schmidt's 1859 edition, which is noted by Körner (*Bibliographisches Handbuch des deutschen*

Book Reviews

Schrifttums) as 'wiederholt aufgelegt', of the Reclam 1910 edition, or of Baker's edition of the play, O.U.P., 1914. In the general section it seems a pity not to mention R. Blume, *Kleist und Goethe*, or Croce's work, this latter being the most severely critical approach to Kleist; and amongst the literature on the play itself space might have been found for Martini, *Kleist und die geschichtliche Welt*, 1940, and H. M. Wolff, *Kleist als politischer Dichter*, 1947.

The above criticisms are, however, largely carping and hair-splitting. The essential is that Professor Samuel has given us an edition of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* which will long remain the standard edition for students in schools and universities, and indeed has given an object-lesson in how to prepare a scholarly and critical edition of a text.

University of Otago

E. W. HERD

GOETHE'S FAUST. AN INTERPRETATION. Alexander Gillies. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1957, pp. 225, 25/-.

Professor Gillies in his Preface says: 'The needs of English-speaking undergraduates formed the starting point of this work'. In recommending this book for its thoroughness, its clarity, its scholarship and its imagination, I cannot suppress a smile at the occasional earnestness to which the undergraduate is subjected; the best example is perhaps: 'It does not, of course, follow that the defects of learning need always be made up for by sin.' (p.21)

Professor Gillies is probably best known to Germanisten as one of the editors of the *Modern Language Review* and the author of *Herder* in the same general series in which this new book appears, *Modern Language Studies*. Most readers will be aware that Dr Gillies speaks with particular authority on Herder and his fruitful connection with Goethe; now in the work which lies before us we have in a related field the outcome of many years of original research and collation of work by others. The title and the Preface have a certain modesty and yet indicate the nature of the work: 'The method which I have adopted has been to allow the text of the complete poem to tell its own story'. Dr Gillies has done much more than this. Even *Faust* does not interpret itself with such stimulating detail of its own accord. What he gives us is first a short history of the composition of Goethe's *Faust* followed by an imaginative and full interpretation of the course of the action. Dr Gillies does not take the poem line by line, but rather quotes the pertinent passage to illustrate his account. Here is an example taken from the chapter *Faust's Despair*, commenting on the scene between Faust and Wagner:

All knowledge is, indeed, a mockery by comparison with the sense of that oneness with nature which Faust is discovering in human life and is yearning to experience more fully. He accordingly angrily closes the conversation, to the regret of his puzzled but pertinacious assistant, with the remark that the acquisition of data is as nothing beside emotional experience, the 'volles Herz', which does not indeed exclude the former, but which alone, when joined with it, can turn it into understanding.

Wer darf das Kind beim rechten Namen nennen?
Die wenigen, die was davon erkannt,
Die töricht g'nug ihr volles Herz nicht wahrten,
Dem Pöbel ihr Gefühl, ihr Schauen offenbarten,
Hat man von je gekreuzigt und verbrannt. (11.589-593)

Wagner, who doubtless represents a phase through which Faust once passed, retires without realizing that his master's observations have quite shattered him. The Enlightenment was nothing, however, if not cocksure.

Book Reviews

Zwar weiss ich viel, doch möcht' ich alles wissen. (1.601) he remarks as he closes the door. How forcibly the difference between the two men is brought out, and how strikingly Faust's initial condemnation of learning has been filled out in this conversation!

The concentration on 'the real progress of the poem', as Dr Gillies calls it, what might be called an omniscient account, does not allow for any discussion of conflicting interpretations; instead, I take it that Dr Gillies assumes, quite rightly, that the student who has absorbed even to a small extent the immense amount of stimulating detail given here will be well equipped to start judging the various publications on *Faust* on their merits.

An interpretation such as this, however, presents Goethe's *Faust* as a coherent, meaningful whole, and there is a tendency to slip over the ambiguities and incongruities. Dr Gillies' explanation, for example, of Goethe's description 'eine Tragödie' I feel to be inadequate; it is not enough to assert that 'its hero's career is profoundly tragic'. Similarly Faust's salvation Dr Gillies sees (and presents the case forcefully) as an outcome of Faust's conversion to public works. 'Faust brooks no delay now that the goal of public service is clear before him . . .' (p.200). But he brooked no delay before. The moral transformation which Dr Gillies sees in the scene with Care does not make him more or less peremptory. There is no change in the egotism of Faust; there is no feeling for his fellow-beings, as we can see in the very lines which Dr Gillies brushes so casually aside:

Wie es auch möglich sei,
Arbeiter schaffe Meng' auf Menge,
Ermuntere durch Genuss und Strenge,
Bezahle, locke, presse bei!

(11.11551-11554)

Commenting on Faust's last speech, Dr Gillies says: 'His ideal for the future is free from any primary taint of private profit or aggrandizement.' Surely Faust never did seek private profit in a mercenary sense, but that enormous preoccupation with self, his egotism, which has been a cause of tragedy throughout the play, is still there:

Es kann die Spur von meinen Erdetagen
Nicht in Aeonen untergehen—
Im Vorgefühl von solchem hohen
Glück
Geniess ich jetzt den höchsten Augenblick.

He can scarcely be said, in these famous lines, to have 'thrust aside his preoccupation with himself'.

I am not wilfully misunderstanding Professor Gillies' thesis, which I think has very much to be said for it, but I am trying to show that his book is, all the time, an interpretation of, and not a critical approach to a complex work.

The book is, like the others in this series, well produced, and the reader's attention is directed in the Bibliographical Note to a comprehensive list of most recent works of interpretation and criticism. I noted only one misprint.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

FREIHERR VOM STEIN. AUSGEWAEHLTE POLITISCHE BRIEFE UND DENKSCHRIFTEN. Ed. by Erich Botzenhardt and Gunther Ipsen. W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1955, pp.xxix + 516. 2 illustrations.

When Ernst Moritz Arndt, Stein's secretary from 1812-1814, in *Meine Wanderungen und Wandelungen mit dem Reichsfreiherrn Heinrich Karl Friedrich vom Stein* (1858) described Goethe's and Stein's journey in 1815 from Nassau to Cologne to determine whether Cologne or Bonn should house the planned new university, he called these men the two greatest

Book Reviews

Germans of the nineteenth century. Goethe's place has never been contested; Stein's ideas and achievement were later totally overshadowed by Bismarck. It is only fitting that Arndt's judgement should be freshly examined on the occasion of the bicentenary of Stein's birth on 26 October 1957. This volume of selected documents and letters unfolds Stein's uniquely rough and outspoken personality, his political philosophy, his participation in the struggle against Napoleon's overlordship over Central Europe, his reforming activities inside Prussia, his far-reaching plans for a unified and constitutional Germany and their failure, and is thus an excellent guide to such a re-valuation. The introduction summarizes the man, his life and his thoughts concisely in 14 pages; at the end both his modernism and traditionalism are judiciously separated from one another. Each section has a general introduction and each document is preceded by a summary and followed by explanatory notes, so that the documents are embedded in a complete life-story. A detailed chronological table and a most useful index testify further to the editors' thoroughness. The texts are based on the edition of Stein's complete works (documents and letters) in 7 volumes running into 5000 pages which Professor Botzenhardt has been preparing since 1955 for the same publishing firm.

University of Melbourne

RICHARD SAMUEL

THE PENGUIN BOOK OF GERMAN VERSE. Introduced and edited by Leonard Forster, London, 1957.

The appearance of this book naturally invites comparison with two other anthologies: with the *Oxford Book of German Verse*, hitherto the standard anthology of German poetry for English-speaking students outside the U.S.A., and with the pocket-edition *Deutsche Lyrik* selected by Walter Urbanek, and published in 1956 as No. 93 of the Ullstein Bücher series.

Professor Forster's anthology is distinguished first by the inclusion at the foot of each page of a prose translation of the poems. If sometimes these translations seem banal and awkward (as for instance the rendering of the last stanza of Rückert's *Kehr' ein bei mir* by 'the tent of my eyes is lit by your glow alone. Oh, fill it quite!' and the questionable rendering of 'Kennst du es wohl?' by 'Do you know it well?' p.216), it is remarkable how often they are successful (cf. the translations from Heine and Hölderlin), and they are justified in that they make this representative collection of German verse accessible to a wider circle of readers.

The main difference between this volume and the Fiedler anthology is in the emphasis shown in selection. Whereas Professor Fiedler chose the majority of his poets from the XIXth Century, and in so doing gave to his anthology a pronouncedly Romantic tone (compare for example the selections from Arno Holz in each anthology), Professor Forster includes 3 extracts from the OHG period, 32 from the MHG period, and a wide selection from the XVth Century and from the Baroque period. A welcome feature is that the Middle High German poems are printed in the original text, as are the selections from the Hildebrandslied and Muspilli, and the dialect poems of J. P. Hebel and Klaus Groth. The XIXth Century suffers in consequence of the increased emphasis on the earlier periods, and poets such as W. Müller, Geibel, Hebbel, Heyse and Liliencron are not represented at all, whilst other favourites of the *Oxford Book of German Verse*, such as Dehmel, Keller and C. F. Meyer, have been severely curtailed. Professor Forster has avoided the difficulty of selection from contemporaries by including no author born after 1900. This may be prudent, but some readers may regret that the editor was not more reckless when they compare the selection made by Urbanek, which includes poems by Hagelstange, Krolow, Celan and Piontek.

The Penguin anthology is superior to both its rivals in that Professor

Book Reviews

Forster has not shunned the inclusion of longer poems where these are necessary to give a truly representative picture. Thus he has included three of the *Römische Elegien*, *Das Lied von der Glocke*, Hölderlin's *Brot und Wein*, Heine's *Es träumte mir von einer Sommernacht*, the sixth Duino Elegy, and Carossa's *Abendländische Elegie*. Although there may be individual regrets over certain omissions (surely it is time that Grillparzer were deemed worthy of inclusion in an anthology?), there seems little doubt that Professor Forster has made a more balanced, a more representative, and a richer selection than that in the *Oxford Book of German Verse*, and one that will commend itself to English-speaking readers more readily than the Urbanek anthology.

The Introduction is supplemented by brief notes on the individual poets, and here Professor Forster exercises sober restraint. There is an unusual reading on p.313—'Du fandst dich längst nach Haus' instead of 'Du fandst ja längst nach Haus', although there is authority for the former reading.

Both compiler and publisher are to be congratulated on producing this excellent anthology.

University of Otago

E. W. HERD

THE FIGURE OF THE MUSICIAN IN GERMAN LITERATURE.
George C. Schoolfield. *The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill*, 1956. pp.xv + 204.

Dr Schoolfield gives us a study of the musician in German literature from Wackenroder and Hoffman to Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*. Such a book could easily degenerate into a catalogue of works with outlines of plot, and the author does not entirely escape from the danger. One is driven, indeed, to ask oneself if peregrination of this sort has any value. From Dr Schoolfield's final paragraph, summing up the 196 pages, one would be led to say 'no':

Certain general conclusions then may be drawn from the foregoing investigation. Literary men have demonstrated a relatively insensitive attitude towards the problems of the musician, choosing to accentuate some particular feature of his personality rather than to treat him as a complete individual. They have likewise lagged behind in their knowledge of musical developments, thus rendering their judgments on music and the musician less valuable than they might otherwise have been. There have been exceptions to the rule, and these major ones. In Kreisler Hoffmann has delineated one of the great original figures of German literature, and Mann's Leverkühn, if not a Kreisler, is surely one of the most important creations in the modern novel. (p.196)

Such a bald conclusion, however, although accurate, is unfortunate and quite unworthy of the book.

As a reviewer one is appalled at the size of the subject, so that it is with a certain admiration that one watches Dr Schoolfield reduce it to order. His main task was to choose significant material, not necessarily of literary merit, from the vast field at his disposal. What he has done is to give an outline of each work and then to examine the musical intensity or genius of the characters and their social position. At the same time he has placed each work in its background in literary history and often made a comment on literary value. Thus we have four main periods, Romanticism, Biedermeier and Poetic Realism, the post-Wagnerian Age (1885-1918) and the Age of Musicology (1918-1947), and running through them like a graph an investigation of music in the novel, the musician in his various forms, composer, player, virtuoso, impresario, the degree of knowledge the author, or more often the character, brings to his subject and his

Book Reviews

purpose, so that we have an unusual approach and new substantiation of our attitude to the literature of the 19th and 20th century.

Dr Schoolfield's most telling points, made with considerable wit, rest on the assumption that there are differences between periods and that they can be summed up in words such as Romanticism, Biedermeier and Poetic Realism. It has the advantage of brevity and one must admit that the author's examples usually leave no doubts in the reader's mind as to what is meant. For example:

Eduard, attaining musical success, marries Adelaide. They go on concert tours together and at the same time found a family, a reconciliation between art and life not so surprising when it is considered how harmless the art has become. The fates of Fanchon and Professor Winter are less happy. Fanchon, encouraged by her mother ('... sollte es auch eine Fürstin zur linken Hand sein, was tut das? Glanz ist Glanz . . .') has been seduced by the prepossessing Albin, an embezzler in disguise. Just before their engagement is announced, Albin is killed in a duel. Fanchon dies in giving birth to Albin's child. Winter goes into a decline; his last hours are cheered by Adelaide's noble voice. Only those characters fit to exist in the Biedermeier world are left alive. (p.65)

But the danger of such generalising compartments may be felt in the following:

'Both Eichendorff's strongly "humanistic" Catholicism and his position in literary history prevent him from expanding the demonic side of Dryander's character'. (p.55) where it sounds as if Eichendorff were ruled by some imperative, external force, his position in literary history.

Dr Schoolfield's discovery of trends is interesting and a necessary basis, but the most interesting part of his work is the twenty pages he devotes to Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*. Much of the analysis is related, of course, to his previous findings in the book to illustrate once again the dichotomies which run through Mann's work, but the book is examined to some extent in its own right, with a semi-digression on the incestuous element in the plot. One could take issue with Dr Schoolfield on various points, in particular where he asserts that 'Leverkühn's music is shown to stem from sexual sources' (p. 190); this is to ignore all the careful milieu-drawing and characterisation, the crisis of culture, the historical background, in fact most of the book, including the title.

One looks forward, after this preparatory work, to a much more detailed examination of a small period or even of a single work from Dr Schoolfield; he has thrown up enough possible lines of investigation to keep students busy for some years, quite apart from the host of other works which can now be looked at in the light of his research.

Misprints in the book, incidentally, are innumerable.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

THEODOR FONTANE. *DIE POGGENPUHLS*. Edited by Derrick Barlow. Blackwell's German Texts. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1957, pp.xxxii + 101.

Die Poggenpuhls opens with an account of the rooms in which the von Poggenpuhls live in genteel poverty in Berlin. The three sisters and their mother are shown in all their individuality and yet as representatives of the aristocracy. The brother, a rather light-hearted lieutenant with the facile, humorous fluency which Fontane could catch so well, comes home on a brief visit for his mother's birthday, and in the conversations set off by Leo's visit and that of his uncle, a retired general, we are given a social and psychological picture of the dispossessed, urbanised, but not quite rootless aristocracy, which is in the main not unaware of its position. Marriages with wealthy Jewish families, with advantages on both sides, are

Book Reviews

discussed. One of the sisters goes to stay with the not so rootless aristocracy in the country, the uncle, whose death gives the family a limited financial security and closes the story.

The story has that gentleness and nostalgia which Fontane felt for the Prussian aristocracy and their way of life along with a penetrating criticism. Every comment, every relationship goes to illustrate the equivocal position, the anachronism of this group in a rapidly industrialising and capitalist society. The mother and the aunt are, significantly enough, both of bourgeois family, and Fontane gives us only one other group of characters, the proletarian Nebelungs, to provide contrast, perspective and at the same time local realism. Fontane is fascinated, especially in his later works, by class and the whole drift of society in the Prussia of 1890, and to delineating this problem he brought his wonderfully acute ear, his skill with dialogue and an ability to select the concrete detail which make his novels masterpieces of social analysis.

Not that *Die Poggenpuhls* is a novel; it is little more than an extended sketch, very similar and in many ways complementary to *Der Stechlin*, which has as its subject the rooted 'Adel' in its native rural setting and deals much more fully and sombrely with the tendencies in Germany only one and a half decades before the first War. But *Die Poggenpuhls* has in miniature a precise yet charming social picture, with that tendency to caricature which is the mark of so many realists.

The work is introduced by a very able essay which gives an historical outline of the social forces at work, followed by an analysis of the story itself, the characters, the realism, the dialogue and the form. Mr Barlow also gives a small but well chosen bibliography and some four pages of relevant and useful notes to the text.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

HEINRICH HEINE. A Biography by E. M. Butler. Hogarth Press, London, 1956. 21/-.

If anyone in English Germanistics should have written on Heine as a contribution to the Heine centenary celebrations, it was my old friend and teacher, Elsie Butler. Unlike most scholars whose retirement is employed to consolidate some long-cherished and laborious piece of abstract research, Professor Butler is using her period of retirement from the Cambridge German Chair to move more and more into the field of *belles lettres*. In her Preface she acknowledges having received much help and stimulation from F. L. Lucas and Leonard Woolf, and the whole Heine biography, in fact, is dedicated to George Rylands, that talented hyphen between Cambridge and Shaftesbury Avenue. The Butler biography of Heine is therefore not mere pedantic scholarship; it is a creative reconstruction of the mental processes of a creative genius whose mental processes have baffled generations.

Heinrich Heine is unfortunately known to too many people only as the poet of the Lorelei—and as the librettist for Schubert, Schumann and worse. His fame is indissolubly linked with the cloying prettiness of German Romanticism, and this has been almost as fatal an obstruction to looking closely at him as was his own world's dangerous faculty for seeing in him only the *chroniqueur scandaleux* of its Bloomsburies. There is, in fact, something of a warning in Heine's fame in the 19th century; it reminds this monolingual world very sharply how international were letters in the 19th century. The list of Heine's friends and enemies ranges from London to Petersburg; he read Dickens and Tyutchev with equal facility, and his sharp tongue was as feared by politicians in London and Vienna as it was abhorred by his personal enemies and the commercial family into which he was born.

Book Reviews

Professor Butler is just the person to write a Heine biography. She has always had a sneaking preference for the mid-19th century, as her excellent survey of Saint-Simonism in Germany and her life of the tempestuous Prince Pückler-Muskau demonstrated. But nothing she touched in her career did she not adorn; was she not the first English critic who dared to write a Rilke-biography which was *not* couched in language of tremulous adoration? And even her recent dabblings in black magic (the trilogy on the background of the Faust legend) have been written with splendid verve and crackling wit. Now she returns to the highly political 19th century, filled with energy and, above all, compassion.

Compassion is sorely necessary when dealing with Heine who was pre-eminently one of those prophets whom the Lord chastiseth for their own good. But let it not be thought that this biographer emulates the Americans in squeezing out our tears for the poet on his notorious 'mattress-grave' (to which a lingering illness chained him for the last 18 years of his life). Professor Butler's compassion is Olympian, like most things about her, except her physique. We are forced to contemplate Heine's sufferings; we are made to see how much was the poet's own fault, through cantankerousness and sheer vindictiveness; but we are also made to see how very like the world it was, thus to spurn and abuse one of its greatest children. Without ever discussing the point, the biographer is extremely clever at pointing out precisely how deeply Heine's radical home-truths offended the respectable mediocre of his day—a crime for which there has never been any pardon given, and one which it is becoming, in this age of the managerial evolution, increasingly unfashionable to commit.

Technically Professor Butler does a good job. The facts are presented lucidly and readably, and if one or two aspects are stressed unusually, this is the biographer's good right. It is possible, for example, that the authoress spent so much time dealing with the *Memoirs*, which the Heine family have suppressed, in the hope of inciting some other scholar or some distant relative to look for them. It is not yet too late for something as precious as this to be discovered; stranger things have happened (even if we leave out of account the strange 're-emergence' of the products of the Kafka factory). It is noteworthy too that, unlike many literary biographers of Heine, Professor Butler does not avoid the poet's close relationships with Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle, though, on the other hand, she does not stress them as unduly as do the paladins of literature east of the 'Iron Curtain'.

In fact if there were one thing more I should have liked, it would have been some meditation on the limitations of the Romantic style. To most people Heine is, as already pointed out, the poet of the Lorelei. This background never seems to have worried him; indeed one of the things he saw but never noted in himself was the death of literary Romanticism and the emergence of modern Realism; we find hints in some of his poetic Apocalypses that the poet anticipated a realist Future, but never more than generalisations. Had Heine possessed the poetic technique of our modern Eliots and Audens, one assumes that he could have overcome many of the weaknesses to which Romanticism exposes a great social satire such as *Atta Troll*. Professor Butler esteems this last poem very highly, as one must. But it is obvious that an *Atta Troll* written by the Eliot of *Prufrock* would have been absolutely devastating—as devastating perhaps as the work of Ariosto in Renaissance Italy. These limitations of Romanticism have not, to my knowledge, been discussed by any critics—with the exception of Martin Greiner, a fairly recent refugee from East Germany, whose judgment is obviously still in a fluid state. As a desideratum, however, I should posit another chapter to this Butler biography, written after a close study of Greiner's 'Between Biedermeier and Bourgeoisie'. It isn't *necessary*, of course, but Heine would have been the first to applaud the critic's right to 'divine discontent'!

I make the point because Heine seems to me to be one of the few German poets with European value; and it would be a shame to think of that value

Book Reviews

as lying solely in a few Romantic *lieder*. Heine was, as he called himself, a soldier who died fighting in a lost outpost for the cause of Freedom; Professor Butler is a sufficiently faithful biographer to make this very clear without losing our *aesthetic* sympathy. She shows a great Radical in all his contradictions, which is something the literary biographers hide and which, as a rule, the Marxist biographers haven't the subtlety to treat.

University of Adelaide

DEREK VAN ABBE

MEDUSA'S MIRROR. Studies in German Literature. August Closs. *The Cresset Press, London*, 1957. pp.viii + 258.

Professor Closs presents us here with some seventeen essays either generalising on Poetry or on specific subjects or authors in German literature. The essays range in length from thirty-five pages on *Substance & Symbol in Poetry* to three pages on Bernt von Heiseler's *Versöhnung*. They are also very uneven in quality. Many of the essays are already known to a specialist audience and his article on *Tristan and Isolde: Gottfried von Strassburg*, which appears here as Chapter III, has stood on its merits as an introduction to a Blackwell text for many years. This essay and the *Minnesang* and its *Spiritual Background* have an informed precision, scholarlyness and coherence which are sometimes lacking in Dr Closs's generalisations on more modern literature. *Austria's Place in German Literature* with its potted literary history more suitable to a tourist booklet stands in strong contrast to the treatment of the mediaeval subjects. Similarly *Gerhart Hauptmann: L'ultimo dei giganti*, in spite of his implied stature, is bundled into ten pages offering a mixture of valuable pointers and elementary outline. I could not help noticing, incidentally, the tentative attitude to Hauptmann ('G. Hauptmann, who in the *Diebskomödie, Der Biberpelz* (1893), had created one of the few successful German comedies, is essentially a playwright, perhaps Germany's greatest in our time' (p.210),) where in the lyric and plastic arts Dr Closs seems to feel no such uncertainty ('[Rilke] went to Paris, where he became a part-time private secretary of Rodin (1902-6). Thus the greatest modern sculptor and, next to Stefan George, the greatest modern poet came into close contact with each other' (p.176)).

Dr Closs's use of language is the greatest barrier to understanding him; there is a feeling of jerky non-sequiturs from sentence to sentence and even within sentences. What, for example, does one make of this: 'If, according to Edison, a genius is 98% perspiration and 2% inspiration, there is certainly much more gold than dross in Goethe!' (p.97)? Or in the following we have a peculiar break within a paragraph and also that Either-Or by which the Germans insist on distorting reality:

Each of us has to face that conflict and make his choice: either to shut oneself off from the irrational forces of human existence and harden one's all too sensitive skin against brutal shocks, or to surrender in self-annihilation. Kant, like other deep thinkers, advocated the irrevocable dignity of man against the market-price of things. Poets like Schiller, Goethe, Hölderlin, and H. von Kleist were the undaunted singers of personal, outer and inner freedom in Germany' (p.44).

One has again and again the feeling that these are lecture or occasional notes, inadequately prepared for publication; Dr Closs apologises, indeed, for 'occasional repetition' but, quite apart from this, it is disturbing in a discussion of European literary criticism to find oneself in the social gossip column:

'Social evenings, excursions to Fiesole and Siena added splendour to the

Book Reviews

Fifth Congress of F.I.L.L.M., which was inspired not only by a desire to bring together prominent scholars of different intellectual outlook, but also of different nationalities representing almost the whole of Europe' (p.241).

Note, incidentally, the position of *not only*. One finds odd facts allied with generalisation ('With C. D. Grabbe, 1801-36, the late-born son of the warder of a jail in Detmold, life becomes utterly futile and senseless,' p.156). The gratuitous titbits of information ('Anything that was paradox or violent in its development was distasteful to Goethe as it was later to Stifter, the author of *Nachsommer*,' p.107) make one wonder what audience the author has in mind. There is, indeed, a naivety in the composition of the book, a mixture of assessment, interpretation and superficial facts, which tends to obscure the value of the generalisations.

It is interesting to note what a cataclysmic world Professor Closs writes in. He talks of 'the present catastrophe' (p.96); 'we live in a world morally and materially lost' (p.162). He tells us: 'Boredom has become our modern curse' (p.103), and he speaks of 'Paul Ernst, the acrid judge of our "barbarous" age . . .' (p.187). 'If we are not to wither,' he assures us, 'we need a new spiritual bed-rock for the survival of our European cultural life' (p.12). And in the sentence:

'Especially now that our civilization is in mortal peril of becoming disrupted by the unbearable split between theoretical research and reality, science and society, mind and body, Goethe's profound conviction of the continuity of life and the oneness of centre and circumference is of vital importance to us all' (p.98).

he is, like a wrestler, putting a whole series of Either-Or locks on our lives, casting us to the ground and then pummelling us with a platitude. He deals in 'the dark forces of existence' and 'poetic vision', caught up, in fact, in the literary clichés of yesterday. Trying to compress the spirit of an age into a phrase inevitably distorts, however illuminating it may be, and the staleness of repetition does not make the apocalyptic insight more penetrating.

Perhaps I have emphasized more than justly the banality ('The length of verse is no criterion of form, for Hölderlin's vision of Hellas *Archipelagus* is as great as Goethe's lyrical jewel, *Auf dem See*', p.26) and the empty abstraction ('The great poet reveals to us the wholeness of human experience in a mysterious existence', p.36), where I tried transposing these abstract words to see if the sentence (given without any further substantiation, incidentally, became more or less meaningful and have not done justice to such felicities as:

'Thus lyrical poetry, like the single poetical word, is balanced between two worlds: Soul and scenery, depth and surface, image and reality' (p.19) which follows a passage of very compact and illuminating comment, with substantiation, on poetic associations.

One has to bear in mind that the long essay, *Substance and Symbol in Poetry*, consists, to use Dr Closs's word, of reflexions and it does not present a thesis; it is a series of, at times, valuable comments and re-statement of the theses of others, and its appeal may well be to the 'lover of literature in general'. The 'student of German,' whom Professor Closs hopes to attract as well, will probably be as critical and impatient as I have been towards this miscellany of aesthetic generalisation and specialist criticism.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

Book Reviews

THE ORIGINS AND PREHISTORY OF LANGUAGE. G. Révész. Translated from the German by J. Butler. London. *Longmans, Green*, 1956. pp.240.

Discussion of problems of which it is known beforehand that they are insoluble can be more than mere entertainment. Careful weighing of possibilities and refutation of unsatisfactory theories mark the distance between scholarly work and idle phantasies.

The late professor of psychology in the university of Amsterdam, G. Révész, author of many books and articles on a variety of psychological subjects, was attracted to the problem of the origin of language. It is difficult to think of one that is further from our reach. If man (and by definition, language) has been in existence for roughly 500,000 years and our knowledge of languages stretches no farther back than about 4000 years, and if at the same time the gap between so-called animal language and real language is unbridgeable, there does not seem to be much to say. And yet Professor Révész, though leaving the problem utterly unsolved, managed to write an enlightening book that can help to clarify thoughts on much more than merely the subject proper. He managed this by embedding language as a social institution in the wider notion of communication, and communication in the still wider notion of contact. With keen insight into animal psychology he is able to make a clear distinction between the cry on the one hand and the warning signal and the imperative call on the other hand. The call being the culmination of the development of non-linguistic communication, the author sees it as the point of departure for the first linguistic forms, which must have been imperative in character.

Once the author begins to build a theory of the properties of primitive language he seems inclined to interpret categories in the Indo-European grammatical system such as 'verbs', 'adjectives', 'optative' etc. as psychological realities. Although the author is conscious of the danger he runs here, a linguist would have been more careful. The idea of a language consisting solely of imperatives or of verbs may be psychologically acceptable; linguistically it is an absurdity, as such categories can be thought of only in contrast with other existing ones.

A theory of the development of primitive sound-systems, and a discussion of primitive psychology such as Ernst Cassirer gave in his *Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen*, which the reader might expect, are lacking. However, the contact-theory and the analysis of communication will definitely have to be reckoned with. They put our notions of language and speech on a broader and more solid basis.

University of Melbourne

J. SMIT

SPANISH CONTACT VERNACULARS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS. Keith Whinnom. *Hong Kong (and Oxford) University Press*, 1956. pp.xi + 130.

Students of language, whether their chief interest be centred in the Romance field or in the East, will welcome this absorbing study of the fast vanishing Spanish vernaculars in the Philippines. The extent to which Spanish was modified through contact with Tagalog is a fairly accurate reflection of the considerable differences between Indo-European and Malayan languages. Most striking is the disappearance of many morphological features: thus the definite article *el* (masc. sing. in Spanish) is used for both genders and numbers, adjectives are invariable, nouns have no gender, and a new form *ele* stands for both 'he' and 'she'. In verbs, time and aspect are expressed by particles, and despite loss of inflections the personal pronouns are omitted almost as often as in Spanish—a point of particular interest to students of French philology.

Book Reviews

The matter is arranged with great pedagogical skill. After a brief historical introduction, the texts are presented with illuminating notes which must enable those whose knowledge of Spanish is very limited to feel their way easily into these vernaculars. There follows an excellent survey of the essentials of grammar, whose outstanding merit is that, after a description along traditional Indo-European lines, an attempt is made to consider the material from the point of view of Tagalog grammar. And this is much nearer the truth for, though the words are Spanish, the structure is largely determined by Malayan linguistic psychology. The same fruitful method is followed in a chapter on the sound-system of the contact vernaculars, which are searchingly examined after a brief comparison of the phonetics of Spanish and Tagalog.

What makes this book particularly valuable is that the author, in addition to a sound knowledge of the Romance background, has obviously made a close study of the substratum language Tagalog, from which he draws many apt and clear illustrations. And the occasional references to Chinese are so much to the point that one could wish the author had been less sparing of these. However this was hardly practicable within the limits of this volume; indeed the wonder is that so much could have been packed in this relatively small space.

University of Melbourne

P. L. CANART

BOOKS RECEIVED

(* Reviewed in this issue)

- ATKINS, H. G. *A Skeleton German Grammar*, London, Blackie, 1957, pp.viii + 87.
- *BEOWULF (Penguin Classics, tr. by David Wright), London, 1957, pp.122.
- CLAYTON, D. E. and FLETCHER, R. B. *Paris, Marseille, Algérie*, London, Harrap, 1957, pp.112.
- *CLOSS, August. *Medusa's Mirror* (Studies in German Literature), Cresset Press, 1957, pp.viii + 258.
- *COCTEAU, Jean. *La machine infernale* (ed. W. M. Landers), London, Harrap, 1957, pp.xxxix + 136.
- COLE, E. and COLE, P. J. *A la recherche du français*, Bk.2. London, Harrap, 1957, pp.272.
- *FONTANE, Theodor. *Die Poggenpuhls* (ed. Derrick Barlow), Oxford, Blackwell, 1957, pp.xxxii + 101.
- FRANCE AU TRAVAIL, LA (ed. H. F. Collins), London, Macmillan, 1957, pp.xix + 193.
- FREY, John Andrew. *Motif Symbolism in the Disciples of Mallarmé*, Washington, Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1957, pp.xix + 158.
- *GIFFIN, Mary. *Studies on Chaucer and his Audience*, Quebec, L'Eclair, 1956, pp.127.
- *GILLIES, A. *Goethe's Faust, an Interpretation*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1957, pp.vii + 225.
- HISTORIA (Les faits divers de l'histoire, nos 122-128), Paris, Tallandier.
- KENWORTHY, B. J. *Georg Kaiser*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1957, pp.xxiv + 217.
- *KLEIST, H. von. *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* (ed. R. H. Samuel), London, Harrap, 1957, pp.209.
- KOLISKO, G. and YUILL, W. E. *Practice in German Prose*, London, Macmillan, 1957, pp.vii + 218.
- MASTERS, R. E. *Vineyard Mystery*, London, Macmillan, 1957, pp.64.
- MITCHELL, A. G. *Spoken English*, London, Macmillan, 1957, pp.vi + 238.
- MODERN GERMAN UNSEENS (ed. Marie Burg), London, Macmillan, 1956, pp.86.
- *NICOLL, Allardyce. *The Elizabethans*, C.U.P., 1957, pp.viii + 174.
- *NURMI, Martin K. *Blake's Marriage of Heaven and Hell, A Critical Study*, Kent State University Bulletin, Ohio, 1957, pp.63.
- ORTON, Eric. *F.192 Hat Verspätung*, London, Harrap, 1957, pp.95.
- *PENGUIN BOOK OF GERMAN VERSE (ed. L. Forster), London, Penguin, 1957, pp.xlii + 466.
- PERRAULT, C. *Fairy Tales* (Penguin Classics, tr. by Geoffrey Brereton), London, 1957, pp.114.

Association News

- *PETTET, E. C. *On the Poetry of Keats*, C.U.P., 1957, pp.viii + 395.
- POCOCK, L. G. *The Sicilian Origin of the Odyssey*, Wellington, N.Z.U.P., 1957, pp.79.
- PRYCE, D. K. and FOSTER, J. R. *French Prose Composition for Sixth Forms*, London, Harrap, 1957, pp.134.
- SAVORY, T. H. *The Art of Translation*, London, Cape, 1957, pp.159.
- *STEELE, Alan J. (ed.) *Three Centuries of French Verse, 1511-1819*. Edinburgh U.P., 1957, pp.xxxvii + 314.
- STRACHAN, W. J. *Ici les provinces*, O.U.P., 1956, pp.192.
- *TAPLIN, Gardner B. *The Life of Elizabeth Barrett Browning*, London, John Murray, 1957, pp.xv + 482.
- TERESA, Saint, *The Life of* (Penguin Classics, tr. by J. M. Cohen), London, 1957, pp.316.
- *THORNTON, Robert D. *The Tuneful Flame* (Songs of Robert Burns as he sang them), Univ. of Kansas Press, Lawrence, 1957, pp.74.
- TYLDEN WRIGHT, D. *The Image of France*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1957, pp.188.
- *VALKHOFF, M. *Masterpieces of Old French Literature*, Johannesburg, Witwatersrand U.P., 1956, pp.ii + 162.
- WAIDSON, H. M. *German Short Stories, 1945-1955*, C.U.P. 1957, pp.x + 104.
- *WHINNOM, Keith. *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*, Hong Kong (and Oxford) U.P., 1956, pp.xi + 130.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

F.I.L.L.M. The Association's official delegate to the Conference of the International Federation of Modern Language and Literature (F.I.L.L.M.) at Heidelberg in August was the Secretary, Dr H. Maclean. He reports that the proposal for the affiliation of A.U.L.L.A. with the Federation, which met with only minor constitutional difficulties, was formally adopted without opposition, and that the affiliation took effect as from August 25th, 1957. A letter has also been received from Dr S. C. Aston, the Secretary of the Federation, warmly welcoming A.U.L.L.A. into its activities. A.U.L.L.A. is thus the first Association outside Europe and America to become affiliated with the F.I.L.L.M. The Heidelberg Conference was attended by several other members of A.U.L.L.A.

Association News

now on leave abroad, including the Treasurer, Mr R. P. Meijer.

The following were elected as Office Bearers of the F.I.L.L.M. for the period 1957-60.

President: Professor L. L. Hammerich (Copenhagen).

Vice-Presidents: Professor Margaret Gilman (Bryn Mawr), M. Pierre Josserand (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), Professor K. Wais (Tubingen), Professor V. Santoli (Florence).

Secretary-General: Dr S. C. Aston (St Catharine's College, Cambridge).

Asst. Secretaries-General: Professor Irène Simon (Liège), Professor W. Friederich (North Carolina).

Treasurer: Professor M. F. Guyard (Strasbourg).

Assistant Treasurer: Dr R. A. Sayce (Worcester College, Oxford).

Subscriptions by member-associations: It was resolved that for Associations with less than 300 members the annual subscription, due on January 1st of each year, should be 20 dollars.

Next Congress: It was resolved that the next Congress of the F.I.L.L.M. should be held in Liège in 1960.

Next meeting of Executive Bureau: The next meeting of the Executive Bureau is to be held in July, 1959. Member associations are entitled to send one accredited delegate to this meeting, and have now to meet themselves the the travel and accommodation costs of such representation.

A.U.L.L.A. Assistant Treasurer in New Zealand. To obviate individual exchange difficulties, the Standing Committee has resolved to appoint, as Assistant Treasurer in New Zealand, Mr T. E. Carter, senior Lecturer in German in the Department of Modern Languages, University of Canterbury, Christchurch. Members in New Zealand will be able, therefore, to pay their annual subscription (£1/16/- N.Z.) within New Zealand and in New Zealand currency.

La France au Travail

Compiled by HERBERT F. COLLINS

An anthology of extracts describing the life and occupations of Frenchmen of all kinds from the factory worker and fisherman to the professional man, writer and artist. Illustrated with photographs. 17s. 3d.

Practice in German Prose

With an Introduction by
G. KOLISKO and W. E. YUILL

The 150 extracts contained in this book have all been used for university tutorials and are graduated in four sections to serve a three or four year course. The majority of them should not be too difficult for higher school forms. 20s.

Modern German Unseens

M. BURG

Compiled to meet the requirements of students preparing for school-leaving examinations. The passages have been selected with the idea of introducing to the pupils some writers of the twentieth century. 6s.

MACMILLAN & CO LTD

32-34 Flinders St, Melbourne C.I